DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 330 VT 013 274

AUTHOR	Gordon, Jesse E.
TITLE	Testing, Counseling and Supportive Services for Disadvantaged Youth.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Inst. of Labor and Industrial Relations.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	263p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, P.O. Box 1567, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Counseling, Demonstration Projects, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Innovation, *Employment Problems, Experimental Programs, Manpower Utilization, *Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, Testing

ABSTRACT

Since the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA), the Department of Labor has funded over $30 million worth of experimental and demonstration (E and D) projects in an effort to discover some new directions for dealing with the unemployment problems of disadvantaged youth. To evaluate the effectiveness of these and similar projects and to chart a course to follow with future programs, this report reviews the nature of these projects in terms of assessment, counseling, and supportive services to disadvantaged youths. Specifically, the report seeks to identify the new knowledge and techniques which are innovations in working with disadvantaged youth and to determine the implications for future policies, programs, and strategies. The major sections of the report are: (1) Introduction, (2) Assessment, (3) Counseling, (4) Supportive Services, (5) Summary of Recommendations for Programs, Plans, and Policies, and (6) Appendix. (Author/JS)

ED052330

Testing, Counseling and Supportive Services for Disadvantaged Youth

experiences of MDTA experimental and demonstration projects for disadvantaged youth

JESSE E. GORDON
The University of Michigan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT 013 274

Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations
The University of Michigan — Wayne State University
1969

ED025330

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1969
Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations

$4.00

This report was prepared under a contract with the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Organizations undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor. Contract No. 82-24-66-29.

Publications Office
P.O. Box 1567
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Contents

INTRODUCTION 1
- Psychological Frame of Reference 2
- Local Initiative and Autonomy 4
- The Meaning of "Experimental and Demonstration" 7
- Demonstration of Practice 8
- Research and Service 8

I. ASSESSMENT 11
- Description 12
  - Tests Used 12
  - Trainee Response to Testing 16
  - Preparing Clients for Testing 19
  - Use of Tests and Test Results 21
  - Test-Retest Uses 31
  - Test Findings 34
  - Validity of Tests 38
  - Clinical Assessment 43
  - Homemade Tests 48
  - Work Experience Ratings 50
  - Work Samples 54
  - Self-Assessment 62
  - Training in Taking Tests for Employment 65

II. COUNSELING 69
- Program Formats 72
  - Primarily Individual Counseling 72
  - Balanced Programs 74
  - Predominantly Group Counseling 75
  - Follow-up 77
  - Counseling Schedules 78

- Goals, Orientations, Principles, and Policies of the Counseling Programs 80
  - Personality Change 81
  - Interventionism 84
  - Speed of Service and Crisis Orientation 91
  - Specific Work Relevance Limitation 93
  - Limited Goals 95
  - Concreteness 96
  - Career Development 97
  - Persistence 100
  - Firmness vs. Permissiveness 104
  - Client Participation and Responsibility for Programs 107
  - Client vs. Agency Definition of Goals 111
  - Middle-Class Behavior Norms 115
  - Turning the Problem Back on the Youths 116
  - Cognitive Orientation 118
  - Strategy of Success 118
  - Programs with Unique Features 119

- Counseling Personnel 120
  - Professionals 120
  - Nonprofessionals 121
  - Race 123

- Specific Counseling Techniques 124
  - Placement Counseling 124
  - Follow-up Counseling 126
  - Rewards and Sanctions 131
  - Group Counseling Methods and Techniques 136
  - Miscellaneous Techniques and Practices 146

- Evaluation of the E and D Experience 149
  - The Context of Counseling: Training and Placement 149

- Miscellaneous 164
  - Group Methods 164
  - Subprofessionals 165
  - Interventionism 165
  - Follow-up 166
  - Counseling in Residential Programs 166
  - Supervision and Staff Leadership 167
  - Effects on Youths of E and D Funding Patterns 168

III. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES 171

- Supportive Activities 172
  - Residential Facilities 172
  - Loans and Financial Support 175
  - Legal Services 177
  - Health Care 178
  - Psychotherapy 181

Recreation 182
Cultural Enrichment 183
Image Building 185
Role Models 186
Miscellaneous 187

IV. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAMS, PLANS, AND POLICIES 191

Future E and E Policies and Programs 191
  Project Initiation and Planning 191
  Project Operations 192
  OMPER Policies 194
  OMPER-Supported Research 196

Operating Agency Practices 198
  Intake 198
  Assessment 198
  Training 200
  Counseling 201
  Placement and Follow-up 204
  Supportive Services 205
  Agency Structure and Administration 207

APPENDIX 209

Introduction

Since the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Department of Labor has funded over $30 million worth of experimental and demonstration (E and D) projects in an effort to discover some new directions for dealing with the unemployment problems of disadvantaged youth. Additional monies from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency; and from other public and private sources have increased the total investment, reflecting the intense national interest in this area, while the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 added a further note of urgency to the search. Added to the understandable interest in the outcome-effectiveness which such expenditures justify, and to the interest in the future of the youths themselves, is the expanding role of the Department of Labor in taking effective action on a national scale, as institutionalized in the Youth Opportunity Centers. It is no more than reasonable that the operations of such Centers should be guided by the knowledge and experience of the experimental and demonstration projects which the Department has sponsored. This report will review the nature of some of this knowledge and experience as it relates to assessment, counseling, and supportive services to disadvantaged youths.

This report concerns itself with three levels of interpretation. At the lowest level, it seeks to describe the major features of assessment, counseling, and supportive services as reported in the documents produced during the period

1962-65 by the MDTA experimental and demonstration projects for disadvantaged youth. Beyond this descriptive level, and with a considerable amount of inference and guesswork tempered with professional judgment, the report will attempt to identify the new knowledge and techniques which are innovations in working with disadvantaged youth that have grown out of the experience of the experimental and demonstration projects.

Ultimately, these two levels lead to a consideration of the characteristics and productivity of the E and D contract program as it has been operating since its authorization by Congress in 1962. One looks backward in preparing such a report, but failure to look both ways can be as debilitating to the historian as to the pedestrian. Thus the focus of evaluation will be on the implications for future policies, programs, and strategies.

Before entering into the substance of this report, it is necessary to note some general features of the E and D program which define some of the limits within which this report must operate. These features will be briefly noted here and returned to often in connection with substantive issues in the body of the report.

Psychological Frame of Reference

The most important general feature of the program is that it locates the problem of youth unemployment within the unemployed youths themselves, and it tries to produce change in the youths by direct intervention in their behavior and experience. None of the projects has been primarily social or structural, in the sense of attempting to define, manipulate, or change economic or social variables, such as: the structure of job opportunities; hiring and promotion patterns; employer judgments and attitudes; or housing, geography, and localization of unemployed populations; or the health, income, and economic character of disadvantagement. While there is general agreement that such factors represent the conditions to which youths have responded in ways which include unemployment, the approach of the E and D program has been to assume that these are conditions which can be changed through changing the youths (or alternatively, that individuals are more readily changeable than such collective variables) as the object of intervention, rather than through direct structural or social action. Thus there were no projects which experimented with providing employers with monetary incentives for hiring disadvantaged youths, nor did any of the projects experiment with breaking up ghettos and ghetto education. It must be clearly stated, then, that the orientation of the E and D program has rested on an assumption which is of questionable validity. It can be argued, and has been, that the unemployed youth is not a psychological cripple so far as work is concerned, that he is not the cause of his unemployment. It has been argued that unemployment and related traits of youth can most easily be changed by changing the stimulus conditions to which they are reacting; that the United States has always had poor, uneducated, minority youths; and that in the past they have been able to "make it" because the American society of the past was more open socially, economically, and politically. Further, one could argue that an economic policy which requires an unemployment rate of 5 percent provides almost all the explanation of youth unemployment needed for a directive for treatment, and that, in the light of such a policy, an experimental and demonstration program which seeks to discover ways of correcting a presumed disability for work within the youth is either beside the point or a red herring.

One need not take sides in this argument for the purpose of this report. It is sufficient to note that the authorizing legislation and the policies governing the administration and implementation of the E and D program are clearly aligned with the psychological rather than the systemic approach. Whether such an approach is viable, in the absence of any controlled manipulation at the system level, is an empirical question which all of the Operation Retrieval reports will seek to answer.

However, the conflict between these two positions has not been escaped by the E and D projects themselves. All are basically aligned with the psychological approach, in the sense that all have obtained their funds by proposing to work directly with disadvantaged youth in a variety of modes designed to produce changes in the behavior of youth as the vehicle for changing their employability. However, implicit agreement with this approach breaks down in the face of what may be at best only modest success in actually changing the level of employment of the youths with whom they have worked. Faced with such outcomes, despite the feelings of project personnel that their programs were good and efficacious, the authors of project reports are constrained either to admit failure in doing what they were trying to do or to come to one of the following conclusions: (1) the project upgraded the youths served, but such upgrading does not become manifest in a local economy in which there are not enough job openings; (2) disadvantaged youths are harder to change than anybody had thought; or (3) the project changed the psychology of the youths, increasing self-confidence, socialization, motivation, etc. but employment is another matter, out of their hands, and in any case of minor importance compared to the magnitude and endurance of the psychological changes produced. It must be noted that the first and third reactions are implicit repudiations of the premises on which the project received their contracts from the Department of Labor; both assume that employability is a function of conditions external to the youth, despite the initial premises on which the projects were based. The second response is, of course, little more than an admission of failure but without a change in premises.

In brief, all projects subscribe initially to the psychological viewpoint and operate on that premise, but many change the premise implicitly when it comes to evaluations of the effectiveness of their psychological operations and programming. Such tactical shifts make evaluation of their strategies extremely difficult.

Local Initiative and Autonomy

A second general feature describes the alternatives within which E and D projects necessarily operated. It would have been possible to construct a grand experiment in which various kinds of employability development programs were instituted in areas of known variation to the socio-economic system conditions discussed above. That is, a centralized experiment program could have set out systematically to measure relevant system or "field" variables in different parts of the nation, then to establish E and D programs of different types in each set of conditions, and thus to relate the outcomes of both field and project conditions, through elaborate but feasible multi-variate analyses. In the field of education, such a program of research has been going on for several years, under UNESCO sponsorship, in which outcomes of secondary education in mathematics are being studied in twelve different countries of known variation in school populations, school structure, etc. That such large scale comparative research is possible is demonstrated by the UNESCO project, and indeed, a similar but smaller project dealing with youth employment services is now in progress under the sponsorship of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

However, such a program would require complete centralization of program design, recording requirements, and adoption of identical criteria in each experimental unit. In opting for local initiative and project design in implementing the research mandate provided by Congress in the MDTA of 1962, a comprehensive evaluation of programs within systems is precluded. Further, under local initiative, the possibility of objective evaluation across projects containing different features is reduced to zero.

In the absence of variations measured systematically across all projects, each program must be evaluated on its own terms. The terms of such evaluation must necessarily be ad hoc and loose, as each project modified its goals and procedures as it went along. Thus, while seeking to identify techniques and knowledge independent of particular project sponsorship or setting, one is led to particularize and to cross too easily the line between discernment of what has been learned and evaluation of specific projects, programs, and agents. For example, counseling was included in all programs, and almost all used group methods. Yet it is not possible to evaluate such use because of differences among projects, not only in how group methods were used, but also in such related areas as whether the group methods included basic education. Theoretically, it would be possible to compare group methods used in conjunction with basic education with group methods without basic education; however, there are still other variables to be considered, such as the extent to which placement emphasized well-paying career jobs compared to short-term placements in deadend jobs. Certainly the efficacy of group counseling may be related to such placement aims, as well as to the integration of the counseling with the project's educational efforts. Adding such factors to the evaluation results in reducing the number of projects involved in the comparisons to comparing each unique project with each of the other unique projects. And at that point, it is hard to know if the particular successes or failures of individual projects are a fault of the techniques used, the kinds of people using them, the program structure, or local economic conditions.

A further consequence of the decision to localize project control and management is the absence of common record-keeping systems. In their absence, the reviewer is faced with a dilemma in his effort to identify new knowledge. Without an evidential base, it is impossible to distinguish knowledge from error. Project reports that such-and-such techniques worked well are extremely unreliable. For example, one project reports its impression that its groupwork program has been markedly successful in changing attitudes; yet the evidence provided by the follow-up research program finds no change in attitudes in the youths served. Where there is such evidence, the reviewer is on a firm footing. Unfortunately, no independent evidence has been collected relative to most assertions made by most project reports regarding the success of their techniques. Thus this report is limited, at the outset, in its ability to identify "new knowledge." The best it can hope to do is identify some techniques which sound as if they might be efficacious, thus resting the judgment squarely on the point of view and professional background of the reviewer.

In dealing with this problem, the reviewer has been guided by the following: (1) a critical acceptance of the impressions recorded by project personnel, on the assumption that the report writers' experiences as they perceived them have some validity and basis in fact--that the writers were neither fools nor knaves; (2) whatever empirical evidence is available in the reports; and (3) the reviewer's own estimate of what is likely or unlikely to be efficacious. The decision to localize project operations has been an ambiguous one, and many projects report efforts by OMAT to influence the nature of their programs, some through persuasion, at other times by making renewal grants contingent upon conformity to OMAT (now OMPER) wishes. In cases of differences of opinion between OMAT and the project leadership, it is likely that there was some distortion or biasing of reports made to OMAT by the projects, further reducing the possibility of objective evaluation of "new knowledge." On the other hand, some project officers requested direct guidance from OMAT, but ambivalence regarding the extent to which the Department of Labor should influence local programming interfered with communication, so that direct requests for aid were not always directly answered. The result is that project officials have been given the opportunity to ascribe difficulties to "federal constraints and interference," on the one hand, and to the absence of clear guidelines, support, and help, on the other.

The Meaning of "Experimental and Demonstration"

There is ambiguity in the basic premise of the E and D program. It is not completely clear whether this term is intended to describe the policy through which the Department of Labor makes its contract awards (e.g., on an experimental basis to programs using some approaches and/or techniques which ought to be tested in practice) or a feature of the projects receiving the contracts. In the former case, one would expect the Department to issue its contracts so as to fund a variety of projects which might then be compared on some defined outcome variables. The projects themselves would be expected to adhere to the approaches or techniques being tried out. In the latter case, one would expect each project to experiment, to try several approaches, and to report on their outcomes. It is clear that some projects took the former position, assuming that their ways of doing things, as embodied in their project proposals, were what the Department wanted them to do. Obviously, in such projects there was very little attempt to try out alternative procedures, and therefore no basis for concluding that the techniques used were better or worse than anything else (or nothing else).

Others chose the latter course, in which program changes were readily adopted (in some cases,too readily, and without adequate evaluation). These projects inevitably generated an air of excitement and exploration which, in several cases, gave the impression of ferment and success far beyond that actually achieved. To be doing something new can easily come to mean doing something good in such circumstances. Thus success, in the sense of fulfilling the mission of the Department (i.e., trying out new and different techniques), is not really identical with success in the sense of doing things which increase employability of disadvantaged youth.

Demonstration of Practice

A fourth general feature of the E and D program lies in the absence of a clear policy concerning the limits of demonstration. Obviously, a large amount of money expended by a highly selected staff in a fully rounded program for a modest number of disadvantaged youth is a very different kind of demonstration from that which seeks to show what can be done with available facilities and run-of-the-mill personnel seeking to serve as many youths as possible. The former may be a demonstration in the sense of serving as a model of the best practice, to which others may aspire; while the latter may be closer to what might be possible in a national manpower program. The former is more likely to be a demonstration of new techniques and methods, while the latter is more likely to demonstrate economical programming. It would be unfair to examine a program in the latter group as if it were a member of the former. It is this situation which has provided critics with their most potent arguments, for if a program is of the former "deluxe" type, it can be charged with being unrealistic as a guide to a national manpower program, while the latter may be criticized for failure to use the unique opportunity provided by MDTA to obtain the best of services and personnel.

Research and Service

A final feature to be noted is an inconsistency between the goals of the E and D program and the route it must follow to meet those goals. At the present moment, the primary concern of the Department of Labor is with the knowledge and experience gained through the use of its MDTA funds. At other times its concern has been with the number of youths receiving services and benefits from MDTA-funded E and D projects. This ambivalence is related to the preceding point, for the deluxe programs tend to devote relatively more of their resources to documentation and codification of their experiences than those more anxious to show how much can be done by as few as possible for as many as need help.

These general features seem to have been the source of much of the strength of the E and D program, as well as its weaknesses. The strength growing out of the alternatives described above lies in the flexibility with which contract awards are made, allowing each proposal to be decided on its own merits.

The weaknesses lie in the gamesmanship strategies in which dyads of mutual dependence and unequal power (OMAT vs. grant-receiving agancies) engage. In the absence of a clear policy in each of the above areas, the projects have been able to preserve a sense of independence from the granting agency by arguing the alternative position in each of the above areas. Thus a program with unimpressive placement figures implicitly rejects its own psychological approach by arguing that it has no control over the system which provides few job opportunities to the youths whom they have made "employable" by a psychological, if not market, standard.[1]

Similarly, programs asked to justify their selection of assessment instruments respond that it is not their role to experiment for the sake of experimentation, but rather to do the best job they know how. Or a project asked to document its "insights," instead talks of the large number of youths it has served, contending that a limitless commitment to service is, itself, a basic technique in dealing with disadvantaged youths, to whom the needs of the bureaucracy for statistics and data are irrelevant.

This latter position draws some of its sustenance from an identification with the anti-establishmentarianism of some civil rights groups, thus throwing the issue into the political arena, in which the federal sponsoring agency is least able to move freely. It should also be noted here that the ethics of agency grantsmanship play a role in this dialectic. Agencies tend to give a major commitment to the clients they serve and to their own viability as agencies; they tend to see federal granting programs as little more than subterfuges required by political realities for giving them federal subsidies and votes of confidence. Often enough the federal administering agencies agree in this interpretation, citing statistics of the number of people served when appealing to socially-minded legislators. Thus the granting agency implicitly encourages the emphasis on service. However, when vis-a-vis more hard-minded legislators, the federal agency is constrained to justify its activities by data. It thus makes demands for documentation which the receiving agency had long since discounted as irrelevant to its needs. The result is an increase of static in the communications between agencies and sponsor and, at best, a collection of statistics on the most easily counted aspects of the project's activities, regardless of their utility for evaluation.

---

[1] There is some irony in the observation that economists frequently throw the ball of youth unemployment to the psychological professions, while psychological practitioners turn to the economists to solve the problem.

Despite these problems, it must be said that the E and D program of OMAT (Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training) and its successor, OMPER (Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research), has been remarkably productive of a sense of ferment, exploration, and discovery in working with disadvantaged young people. It has pioneered in an area which had heretofore received scant attention. The programs it has sponsored have come very close to completely and fundamentally changing traditional practices and concepts, and have generated a mass of ideas and notions, however inchoate they may be. It is the task of this report to find order in that inchoate mass.

I

Assessment

It is not always easy to discriminate between assessment and other program elements such as counseling (in which there is a continuous process of assessment by the counselor and client); training (especially when tests are used as vehicles of teaching, as the subject to be taught, as criteria for teaching effectiveness, and as evaluations of trainee needs and progress); and work experience which forms one of the contexts in which assessment took place in E and D projects. The problem is further compounded by the observation that assessment techniques, even when serving an exclusively assessment function, vary in their formality from highly structured aptitude, interest, and personality tests; through formal behavioral observation and rating; to informal and "clinical" evaluations. Thus the decision to include particular program elements in the assessment section of this report may, in some cases, be arbitrary. The writer has made his selection according to the following criteria: (1) all tests applied to trainees (e. g., rather than to subprofessional or volunteer staffs, or to trainees as subjects in research); (2) all processes having as clear aims an effort to characterize, describe, or "place" the trainee vis-a-vis other trainees, workers, or training and/or job requirements; and (3) procedures used, generally during intake, to make decisions about the status and needs of trainees, or about their suitability for the project.

This report will deal first, on the descriptive level, with the use of psychological and vocational tests; trainee responses to testing; the preparation of trainees for testing; the use to which tests and test scores are put, including test-retest evaluations of program effectiveness; and a summary of pertinent test findings.

The report will then describe less formal and non-test assessment procedures, clinical evaluation, homemade "tests," ratings of work experience performances, and work samples. The descriptive section will conclude with two special aspects of assessment: self-assessment, and training in taking employment tests. The report will then move to the evaluative level with a listing of the major innovations and new knowledge in each of the above areas, a statement of some general problems needing further exploration, and some conclusions and recommendations for further programming.

DESCRIPTION

Tests Used

The following is a list of the tests cited as being used by the E and D projects, with the number of projects using each test. This list is incomplete in several respects: (1) there is no necessary relationship between the number of projects citing a particular test and the number of youths given the test. For example, the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) was administered selectively by several projects, making it second only to the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) in number of using projects; however, within each project, the WAIS was used for special problems requiring extensive diagnostic exploration, while the GATB was given to as many youths as would take it. (2) Many project reports do not mention any tests, or mention tests by type rather than by name. It is a testimony to the inadequacy of documentation in many projects that some reports contain inferential evidence that a particular test was used, but do not specifically cite its use in their sections on assessment. This is particularly true for the GATB, which was probably used in almost all projects, though it is mentioned by name in only fourteen project reports. Several reports omit any description of assessment, although only three projects clearly had no assessment function (NCCY, Pinellas County, NILE).[2]

---

[2] See appendix for full names of projects which will be referred to by initials of short nicknames in the body of this report.

LIST OF TESTS USED

General Aptitude Test Battery	(14)
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale	(13)[a]
Kuder Preference Record	(7)[b]
Thematic Appreception Test	(7)[c]
Wide Range Achievement Test	(6)[d]
Wonderlic Personnel Test	(6)
Revised Beta (intelligence)	(5)
Bender-Gestalt	(4)
Gates Reading	(4)
Gray Oral Reading	(4)
Minnesota Clerical	(4)[c]
Rorschach	(4)
Stanford Achievement	(4)
Differential Aptitude	(3)
Metropolitan Achievement	(3)
Minnesota Paper Form Board	(3)
Otis Intelligence	(3)[e]
Raven Progressive Matrices	(3)
SRA Mechanical Aptitude	(3)
Woody-McCall Arithmetic Fundamentals	(3)
Bennett Mechanical Comprehension	(2)
CATB	(2)
California Achievement	(2)
Crawford Tweezer and Screwdriver	(2)
Draw-A-Person	(2)
General Clerical Test	(2)
House-Tree-Person	(2)
IPAT	(2)
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence	(2)
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory	(2)
Mooney Problem Check List	(2)
O'Connor Dexterity	(2)
Purdue Pegboard	(2)
Armed Forces Qualification Test	(1)
Armed Forces Classification Test	(1)
Bennett Hand Tool	(1)
Edwards Personal Preference Test	(1)
Flanagan Aptitude	(1)
Flanagan Coordination	(1)
Flanagan Arithmetic	(1)
Flanagan Inspection	(1)
Gates-McKillop Reading	(1)
Hackman-Gaither Interest	(1)
Hand Test	(1)
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	(1)
Kuhlman-Anderson Intelligence	(1)

Los Angeles Reading	(1)
MacQuarrie Test of Mechanical Ability	(1)
Minnesota Achievement Series	(1)
O'Connor Wiggly Blocks	(1)
Progressive Achievement (reading)	(1)
Purdue Non-Language Intelligence	(1)
Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration	(1)
SRA Achievement Series	(1)
Sentence Completion	(1)
Slosson Intelligence	(1)
Stanford-Binet Intelligence	(1)
Stromberg Test	(1)
Survey of Mechanical Insight	(1)
Thurstone Clerical	(1)
Thurstone Mental Alertness	(1)
Thurstone Typing	(1)
Vocational Values Inventory	(1)
Sixteen Personality Factors	(1)

[a] Two projects ceased using this test on the grounds that it required too high a reading level (St. Louis JEVS) or that the experience of the rural youths in Michigan's Upper Peninsula was too limited to allow them to make meaningful choices among the alternatives on the test (NMU).

[b] One project dropped this test because the stories told by the youths about the picture stimuli were so short and restricted that they provided too little data for interpretation (Springfield-Goodwill).

[c] One project ceased using these tests because they were too time-consuming; they substituted a homemade test for group administration for the Wide Range (YOB II).

[d] This test was used largely to familiarize trainees with employment tests in general, rather than as an assessment of the trainees.

[e] Two projects dropped this test when it was found that it yielded scores lower than the verbal tests which they had sought to replace (YOB II).

One project made some special arrangements for its Spanish-speaking youths; it used a Spanish-language test (AA Tests Comprehension mechanical), the Performance Scale of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, and on occasion used an interpreter to administer the tests (PAL). Another project used informal work try-outs in lieu of testing for non-English speaking Puerto Rican youths (VAS-Altro).

At least eight projects which used the GATB did so in cooperation with state employment services, to whom the youths were referred for testing, or through arrangements in which Employment Service personnel conducted the testing at the project site. In some of these projects, Employment Service screening and referral forms, required by MDTA, were completed by an Employment Service representative stationed at the project site, full or part time, so that project intake personnel would not have to send applying youths to another office in another part of town for Employment Service clearance. This arrangement made the intake more accepting and personal for the youths (e. g., Neighborhood House, JOBS).

Springfield Goodwill suggests that the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale be given before the Draw-A-Person test. To generalize, this suggests that objective structured tests of relatively clear vocational relevance precede less structured and projective tests which are likely to appear foreign or irrelevant to the youths.

The writer is struck by the observation that the above list is entirely composed of old standard tests. There has been little or no experimenting with newer instruments, or even much searching in O. K. Buros' Mental Measurements Yearbook for less well-known tests, or for tests that go beyond the most obvious and traditional ones in the counseling-guidance repertoire. For example, not a single project reports even experimenting with the Ammons Picture Vocabulary Test, despite the fact that the Job Corps specifically selected it for use with disadvantaged youth. Other non-verbal tests are also missing, such as the Leiter International Scale.

A second observation that may be offered is that, by and large, the selection of tests and testing programs seems more determined by factors of expediency than by a careful and comprehensive evaluation of the merit and worth of available and relevant tests. There can be no excuse for use of the Kuder Preference Record instead of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The Strong is the most versatile and best standardized non-intelligence test in existence; it takes longer to give and to score than the Kuder, but the Kuder offers only a limited range of interpretations and in any case has never been validated at any acceptable level. It seems likely that a preference for ease and convenience also lies behind the large number of projects which use the GATB routinely, even where there is no question of referral to MDTA training. The likely reason is that state Employment Services administer the GATB, thus taking the burden off the project. This interpretation receives added weight when one notes that many of the projects which use the GATB claim that it is neither useful nor desirable for the population served.

One project listed a fair number of tests but, in fact, seldom used any but the GATB. To prefigure a later section of this report, there is much reason for thinking that the use of tests for assessment purposes recieved the least adequate attention from the E and D projects. It was the area in which they were least likely to honor their contract commitments. There was little interest in testing expressed in project reports, and a good deal of opposition to testing in principle as well as in practice among project staffs.

Trainee Response to Testing

Some typical experiences mentioned in project reports are: many trainees refused to finish the test battery (KEY); testing during intake interfered with the establishment of rapport in the group counseling (KEY); of 136 scheduled for testing, only 85 showed up (NAACP-UL); there was a large "no-show" rate for the regularly scheduled GATB testing on the week following intake (YOB I); of 148 scheduled for the GATB, 58 showed up (YOB II); most of those scheduled for testing on the regular testing day failed to show up (Neighborhood House); and the trainees resisted the MMPI (Des Moines).

A great number of youths dropped out of the program during the intake phase, which included extensive psychological evaluation and psychiatric interview. In a follow-up study, some trainees described the depth interviews as insulting, silly, irrelevant, or offensive and intrusive (PEPSY).

The youths resisted going to vocational rehabilitation for testing because they did not define themselves as sick or requiring rehabilitation (Syracuse).

It is clear that many projects found youths to be resistant to and rejecting testing during the intake phase. One can speculate on the effects of such resistance on the relationship between the youth and the project; clinical experience suggests that a youth who "skips" his appointed testing is likely to feel somewhat guilty or embarrassed, even if the project accepts his failure to be tested. He will also have found himself accomplishing the first step of a disengagement or withdrawal from the program. This feeling of estrangement from the project may make him less likely to become personnaly involved in the project's programs. Thus, those who do not acutally drop out during intake testing are likely to drop out psychologically, to some extent, in response to their own failure to take the tests.

One project (JOBS) reported no negative response to testing during the first week of the youth's participation in the project. However, some JOBS workers reported in an interview that although few youths walked out of the initial testing, the characteristic approach to the tests was lackadaisical, uninvolved, uninterested, and lacking in serious intent.

If youths may be described as generally rejecting testing during intake, other experiences reported in project documents may help mitigate the gloomy picture.

One project reports that youths accepted testing after just one or two talks with the counselors about the testing, the tests, and what the scores would mean and be used for (Springfield Goodwill).

Another project indicated that although it was difficult to obtain information from youths during intake interviewing because of defensiveness and a noncommittal style (playing it cool), the project found that it could elicit the information it wanted after the youth had been accepted into the program and had worked in it for a while (Philadelphia JEVS).

The Syracuse Skills Center reports that youths not only accepted but welcomed tests after they had been in the training program for a few weeks, because they wanted to know their own strengths and weaknesses.

Another project describes "unprecedented acceptance" of testing by youths who are usually resistant to testing, after the purpose of testing had been explained (CCY).

Other programs do not report on the question of acceptance or resistance to testing, but it seems likely that in some (e.g., CPI, PAL) acceptance was achieved by making the decision to test and take tests a joint one between the counselor and the youth; in such cases, client resistance to testing does not become manifest, because the client participates in the decision-making process.

It seems clear from the foregoing that disadvantaged youth are generally resistant to testing, and that this resistance manifests itself through refusals, dropping out, lack of serious trying on the tests, or simple failure to show up at testing sessions. In disliking tests, such youths are probably not very different from the middle-class youths usually seen in vocational guidance agencies. Nor are disadvantaged youths more lacking in curiousity about themselves. If there is a difference between the classes, it probably lies in the lower-class youth's suspicions and fears about what the tests will say about him and how they will be used, and in absence of the polite passivity which characterizes middle-class clients when they are faced with demands for achievement and scholastic performance as are called for by tests. Thus, lower-class youths express their dislike and distrust of tests more directly.

Despite this initial distrust, some of the experiences cited above indicate that disadvantaged youths do accept testing after they have been in a program for a while. Perhaps the difference lies in a suitable introduction to the testing, and/or in a strong enough relationship between a youth and an agency for the youth to feel less threatened and defensive about revealing himself, and/or in the development in the youth of enough feelings of self-confidence and acceptance to enable him to tolerate the threat which tests suggest, and/or a change from a defensive orientation to a commitment to making positive plans requiring realistic self-knowledge, and/or in the youth's feelings that he can control the use to which testing and test results concerning himself are put. It may be simply a matter of trust in the project, or commitment to participating in it. In any case, it seems clear that it is less possible to omit test preparation and introduction procedures with disadvantaged youth than it is with less overtly resistant and more trusting middle-class youths.[3]

[3] It can hardly be considered an item of new knowledge, or a discovery that one ought to prepare a client adequately for testing. Nevertheless, this injunction is commonly ignored in bureaucratically-structured agencies. Such an omission is either less crucial, or less obviously crucial, in agencies which deal primarily with middle-class clients, than it has revealed itself to be in the E and D projects.

Preparing Clients for Testing

Agencies varied greatly in the extent to which youth were prepared for testing and in the timing of the testing in the total program. KEY did its testing during intake, and encountered resistance and difficulty, as noted above. Hunter's Point also tested during intake, but reports do not mention acceptance or rejection. On the other hand, counselors at CPI referred youths for testing when the youth and the counselor agreed that the youth was ready to take tests. Obviously, discussion between counselor and client of readiness for testing is likely to include discussion of the nature of the tests and how they are to be used, and thus contribute to the understanding and acceptance of the tests. Similarly, YOB II reports that its clients resisted testing if the counselor did not wait until a youth was "ready" for testing before making a referral. Unfortunately, YOB II does not indicate how readiness was determined, or who determined it.

Other projects which delayed testing until after intake include the Syracuse Skills Center, which found that youths who had resisted going to a vocational rehabilitation bureau for testing during intake became interested and desired testing within the Skills Center as a means of self-assessment after they had been in the program for some weeks. The Detroit Mayor's Youth Employment Program does not report any difficulties in getting the youths to take tests; in that program (which had a relatively high level of youth, 85 percent high-school graduates), testing was done during the course of a two to three week orientation period conducted largely through group counseling. Springfield Goodwill also had an extensive introductory period, devoting the first three weeks to assessment. They report good acceptance of testing after one or two talks with a counselor who explained the nature and purpose of testing, and reassured the client. PAL presented the reasons for testing and appraisal and the nature of testing, along with other counseling/guidance material, in two hour-and-a-half group counseling sessions, as part of its intake. The youths were then free to select the parts of the program they felt they needed, presumably including or excluding testing as they wished.

Therefore, it seems that there is some experience to indicate that testing can be delayed until a youth has participated in the agency's program for some time and that, when so delayed, the testing seems more meaningful and acceptable to the youth. On the other hand, one project felt that its delayed assessment posed difficulties, in that the counselors and staff had to wait too long before the assessment was accomplished. Unfortunately, this project's reports do not indicate any ways in which such lateness or delay in assessment interfered with optimal services to the youth, especially as the program had too restricted a range of alternatives available to it to match youths to training or to available jobs.

Some projects report that youths accepted testing even during initial intake if the tests were briefly introduced, thus suggesting that a longer period of participation in the program is not required to achieve acceptance. One large midwestern project tests during the first week, after the youths are told that: they "can't fail these tests," the tests are used solely to assess their own needs for training and to help discover their vocational assets. Similarly, CCY informs its youths that the tests are not used against them, and are used only to discover vocational interests and goals. Both projects report that these introductions are effective, but other evidence described above throws the midwestern report into doubt. In fact, that project was being less than honest in its introduction to testing, as the project did assign applicants to training units differing in prestige value and placement potential on the basis of test scores. This use of test results was apparent to the trainees; project personnel reported that trainees resented being placed in the "dummy" group, and wanted to be assigned to the Central unit which specialized in secretarial and office work training, to which those with the highest test scores were assigned. It is possible that this lack of candor to trainees who "knew the score" may account for the trainees' general lack of involvement in the testing, as described earlier.

Such reports suggest the conclusion that when assessment has been delayed until the trainee is familiar with and involved in the program, they accept it, that tests may be accepted even in initial contacts with the agency if they are adequately introduced as being for the trainee's benefit, and if the introduction is an honest one.

Use of Tests and Test Results

The achievement of acceptance of testing by disadvantaged youths is only one element in designing an assessment program; far more important is the question of the end for which the tests are to be used. Yet it is on this question that project reports are most sketchy.

For Counseling and Treatment

One project reports that tests were given to applicants on the basis of staff recommendations that more information regarding the applicant's status and needs be obtained before the applicant was accepted into the program. Yet this project does not seem to have rejected any applicants, although many were admitted on probation only, pending remedial work where indicated. Presumably, the tests were used to guide the staff in designing individualized rehabilitation programs. Presumably also, the results of the testing were used in counseling the client. Since the report is silent about such use, the most that one can infer safely is that the test scores were primarily needed and used by staff, rather than by clients.

In Boston's ABCD, counselors again determined when tests were needed or desirable. This determination was made in the course of counseling, and the tests were administered by the counselor (after a reassignment made the test specialist unavailable). It seems likely that test scores entered directly into the content of the counseling. CPI was quite clear about its use of testing as a counseling resource; and as in ABCD the decision to test was made in the course of counseling and by the counselor. The test results were also used by CPI in determining training or job placements. In this connection it is worth noting that CPI made a special arrangement with the Connecticut Employment Service which permitted a modification of GATB standards for admission into MDTA training courses. The modification was one which allowed high scores to compensate for below standard scores in the OAPs, and thus permitted more disadvantaged youths to qualify for MDTA training. CPI also had permission to overrule GATB scores in selected cases where there was strong non-test evidence of ability to profit from training.

Only two other projects report counseling use of test scores. However, as noted earlier, one of these felt that it obtained its assessments too late. Presumably this means that most counseling and decision-making had been concluded by the time the assessments were available.

One probable reason for a general lack of use of test scores in counseling is the emphasis in most projects on group counseling procedures, almost to the exclusion of individual counseling. Although it can be done, most group counseling avoids dealing within the group with test scores of the group members. The only project which did report using test scores in the group was Action Housing, in which the scores were presented as a self-confrontation device which all members of the group discussed. Thus those programs which used test scores in counseling tended to be the few programs which relied primarily on individual counseling rather than group methods.

Test scores, as part of elaborate psychiatric and psychological appraisals, were also used as guides to treatment by two projects; in both, the emphasis was on personality diagnosis rather than specific vocational needs, talents, and disabilities. Both projects used their assessments as bases for planning casework interventions, with personality and psychopathological factors far outweighing the purely vocational. Indeed, the report of one of the two makes the incredible remark that work and job placement must not be allowed to interfere with the individual client's self-development, thus neatly turning the tables on the orientation of most of the E and D projects, which more generally took the stance that personal problems should not be allowed to stand in the way of work and job placement. This latter orientation went along with a tendency to see personal problems as at least partially as a result of joblessness and its attendant characteristics; on the contrary, the project referred to above took the position that joblessness was a pathological symptom of underlying personality problems.

One New York program, which was jointly run by two independent agencies, was also clinically oriented, and used assessment results to plan casework services. Their report also stated that the assessment experience made clients more available to further counseling about personal matters, since interviews with a psychiatrist and social worker about personal matters were part of the assessment process. However, selection for training was the responsibility of one of the agencies which did not share the philosophy of the other. Thus, in general, test scores were used to select applicants for training in the project, while clinical assessments were used as a basis for treatment. However, even the use of tests in selection was eroded by poor recruitment, which resulted in the project accepting almost all applicants who were interested, regardless of scores.

Thus test scores, as such, were cited as being used directly in counseling but only four or five projects.

For Admission to the Project

In addition to the unsucessful use of tests for selection described above, three other projects did use test scores in determining admission to the project's services. These were: the YMCA project, which had only two skill training courses, and so necessarily had to reject applicants without the necessary aptitudes; KEY, which rejected applicants of very low intelligence before the project discarded the psychiatric orientation which had prevailed initially; and a midwestern sheltered workshop. This last also rejected applicants of low intelligence, as if low intelligence was not a sufficient disadvantage. It should be noted in this connection that the Philadelphia JEVS, with a program very similar to the midwestern sheltered workshop, found many trainees, testing at well below average intelligence, performed at acceptable standards in its workshop, and KEY later found that it could offer its services to many of those who had been initially rejected for too low intelligence.

Only four projects consistently used test scores as a basis for selection for project services, and there is serious question about the validity of such use by three of them. In general, where projects are organized to provide a multiplicity of services depending on client needs, there is little need for selection testing. This suggests that most projects felt that they should develop services to meet the needs of their youths, rather than select only those youths who needed or could use the services the projects already offered. It is in this sense that the projects were youth-oriented rather than tied to particular service elements. As will be discussed later in this report, this stance encountered serious difficulty in one major respect; many projects reported that they could simply find nothing effective to do with younger clients (below eighteen years). However, this problem is not one that could have been cured by selection testing. It appears that there was little justification or need for the use of tests as criteria of admission to projects and their services, except where project offerings were severely restricted. We will return to this issue in a later section of this report, when we deal with the question of what happened to youths admitted under the "open door" policy to programs which had not yet set up or arranged for the services needed or wanted by such youths.

For Assignment to Training

The initial intake testing done by most projects was not for selection purposes, seldom for counseling and treatment purposes, but was frequently used as a basis for assigning youths to project services, particularly training. As mentioned earlier, it was one of the uses made of test scores by CPI, and probably also by KEY. However, it is also apparent from the KEY report that MDTA classes were run on a quota-filling basis, and that in the face of a need to fill classes and a need to get a youth into some kind of training, no matter how inappropriate the available courses were, test scores, as criteria, were jettisoned. Unhappily, this state of affairs was more characteristic of the E and D projects than was selective use of tests for assignment to training. Similarly, in a Washington sheltered workshop, which used an extensive three week period of testing and assessment before assignment to training, assignment was, in the end, made exclusively on the basis of the availability of training stations and the expression of interest by trainees. Exactly the same situation existed in a large west coast project. A federal prison project was another in which tests were given to provide a basis for assigning trainees to classes. There the trainees all scored below the arbitrarily set standards, and since the classes had to be filled, the trainees were assigned anyway. In that project, trainees tended to get dumped into food service training as a catch-all to fill the quota, without regard to tested interests or aptitudes.

The report by Neighborhood House was most explicit in this regard. It notes that theoretically assignment to higher skill training was to be based on factors such as motivation, age, willingness to prepare for and take tests, test results, freedom from personal problems, social maturity, performance in work experience stations, and ability to work in groups without disruptive behavior. But, in fact, all such criteria, including test scores, were overridden by the simple question of whether there was a training slot available of any kind at all.

A similar process occurred at the other end of the country. In a major eastern city the Employment Service screened girls for a course in secretarial work but, since the course was the only stipend-paying training available to the unemployed girls, the girls took referral to the course regardless of interest or skill, and since the Employment Service needed to fill the class, it sent girls regardless of test scores. Needless to say, many of the girls dropped out of training.

The nadir of this kind of thing was achieved in California, where many youths were assigned to a forestry camp for work experience training despite the fact that outdoor interests are consistently lowest on Kuder profiles of disadvantaged youth.

A rural border state project tried to use test scores to assign trainees to MDTA classes and did so. However, in that program the classes were so irrelevant to the structure of occupations and the job opportunities available, and were so far removed from developing actual job skills and competence, that the assignments on the basis of aptitude and interest were gratuitous.

Only three other projects used tests as a basis for assignment to training: the Hunter's Point project used the GATB for establishing qualifications for MDTA training; a Chicago project used its tests as a basis for assigning trainees to training units, with the consequent problems cited earlier; and PAL used individual diagnoses, based on test scores and other data, to make recommendation for training as well as treatment. For reasons to be presented in the section on test invalidity, the writer considers the use of the GATB in these circumstances as unjustifiable (although it was probably at the insistence of the state Employment Service). There were therefore only two projects with any semblance of justification for their use of tests in assignment to training, and one of these had a good deal of grief over it. Out of thirteen projects which sought to use tests as a basis for assignment to training, testing was done meaningfully and without extensive difficulty by only two--CPI and PAL--as far as can be ascertained from the project reports.[4]

One must conclude from this history that the E and D projects were unable to demonstrate any techniques for using published tests in the assignment of disadvantaged youths for training. Unfortunately, the nature of the problem was such that one could not conclude that the inutility of tests for such a purpose was demonstrated; had there been adequate training facilities available, the tests might have been used for selective assignment, and might have worked. What one can conclude is that in the absence of adequate training facilities to which the youths can be referred, there is no point in giving them selective placement tests. It is this consideration which refelcts badly on the "open door" admission to programs described earlier, for such open admission runs into difficulty when program resources for doing anything with the youths are too limited.

For Selective Placement

A further common use of test scores was practiced by a number of projects: tests were given to serve as guides to job placement by Hunter's Point, KEY, New Jersey OEO, PAL, YOB I, and YOB II, and, probably, most of the other projects. However, in all except PAL, as far as can be told from the project documents, the same difficulties were encountered. The shortage of job openings of any kind; the preponderance of work opportunities in low-level, unskilled, dead-end jobs; and the almost uniform insistence by the youths that they be referred to jobs as soon as possible, made selective placement impossible for all the projects that tried it. Only PAL and YMCA (which was able to place selectively because it trained selectively) were able to do it at all.

[4] This state of affairs cannot be blamed entirely on the projects. Many would have preferred using their tests more effectively but for various reasons beyond their control could not: failure to obtain funding or approval for MDTA classes, obduracy of MDTA testing requirements, lack of cooperation from local and state vocational education departments, and failure to receive adequate funds, or to receive them on time, from OMAT. Thus, training facilities either were not available or, because of split responsibility, were inappropriately conducted for disadvantaged youths. Nevertheless, one wonders why projects did not then stop testing.

It is in relation to this issue that the fundamental assumption of the E and D projects, that employability can be changed by changing youth, falls down dramatically and tragically. In the absence of adequate job opportunities (and in the absence of any particularly novel or ambitious attempts at job development by the E and D projects in general) there is no possibility of experimenting with or demonstrating the use of tests for the selective placement of disadvantaged youth. The one project which did consistently make good jobs available to its youth (YMCA) did not do placement testing, using instead the youths' performances in the training program as a guide to placement. The practical lesson to be learned from this is that a project must be adequate on all fronts if any part of it is to function effectively as a test or demonstration of techniques. One can only marvel at the rigidity of the project personnel who continued to administer aptitude and ability tests despite their own awareness of how little they influenced assignment to training and how little the jobs available placed a premium on skill and ability. This subject will be touched on again in the discussion of the validity of tests, and in relation to the use and effectiveness of counseling.

Two other uses of tests in E and D projects ought to be mentioned. The first is related to their use in making selective placements; the second is novel and represents an innovation which seems quite promising.

Other Uses

The first is the use of tests to estimate readiness for placement, as compared to their use in guiding the type of placement. Hunter's Point used tests in this manner, as did KEY and YOB I. In general, this meant that if on intake testing the client showed clear interests and some well-defined aptitude, he would be referred directly to placement rather than to counseling or training. However, there is some reason for thinking that these bases for referring to placement were unrealistic in some job markets, where as far as the employer was concerned a strong back was the essential requirement for the temporary jobs he had available. This seemed to have been more true for Hunter's Point and YOB I than for KEY, probably reflecting differences in geography rather than differences in project effectiveness (except in the sense that project effectiveness must be judged by its appropriateness to local conditions which is, after all, the basis for the decision to decentralize E and D project sponsorship, as discussed in the Preface to this report).

An anecdote related in the Neighborhood House report illustrates the problem. The project referred three boys to a temporary manual labor job (shovelling earth) because of the need of the boys for work and their readiness, as the project judged readiness. Unfortunately, the boys "leaked" the news to some friends who were also in the project and who were, presumably, not yet "job ready." The friends stole the march on the referred boys, showing up at the work site and representing themselves as the referred boys. They got the jobs and started doing the work, apparently acceptably enough, when the first three boys showed up, putting the employer in a quandary. Aside from the obvious implications regarding the so-called lack of motivation of disadvantaged youth, the anecdote illustrates the irrelevance of the concept of job readiness when the only jobs available are of the kind described.

The second, the innovative use of tests, is their use as vehicles for stimulating basic education as a part of training in becoming test-wise. This use, engaged in by seven projects, has significant potential, and therefore will be dealt with in a later section of this report devoted to training in passing employment tests.

Test Misuses

The testing specialist at one project refused to send the test scores of trainees to agencies to which the youths had been referred for services, in an effort to guarantee the privacy of the youths. Unfortunately, the net effect was not only to require the youths to take the tests over again at the receiving agency but to block communication, so that there was little possibility for integrating project services with those of other agencies in the community.

A similar problem in communication occurred in a southern residential counseling program, though not in connection with test scores. It was reported that the assessments made by the residential staff were usually rejected by MDTA and Employment Service counselors dealing with the same youths, if their assessments differed, and that this lack of communication was the result of their professional disdain for the qualifications of the residential staff.

At the other extreme there are suggestions in some reports, notably of those agencies which used very clinical kinds of assessment procedures, that diagnoses and assessments may have been circulated too freely to potential employers and other agencies, resulting in a loss of privacy which may have further disadvantaged some job seekers. It was noted in one report, for example, that there were some who felt that having an Employment Service representative at the project and familiar with all the "dirty details" of the youth's life could operate against the youth. The Employment Service representative might, having more knowledge of a project youth than he does of a non-project youth, assume the project youth is not job ready, and when he is considered job ready, treat him with caution, while a non-project youth, in the absence of other information, is presumed to be capable of handling a placement and so is given job referrals at once. Thus the net effect on a youth of being in the project is to have reduced rather than enhanced chances for placement. This possibility is certainly not disproved by project placement figures, from which it appears that project dropouts were able to obtain jobs on their own at a rate not significantly lower than that achieved by the projects for non-dropouts. And a reading of many project reports suggests that the youths served had the double hurdle of having to convince their counselors and then the placement officers that they were ready to work, before they were tried out on a job. In some cases, project personnel directly blocked placements of some youths whom the project felt were not ready. Thus, in some cases, projects operated as barriers to employment no less effectively than the dynamics of the open job market. This is especially unjustifiable when one considers that in some of the same projects the jobs which became available to the youth when the staff finally agreed to the youth's readiness for placement were the dead-end manual jobs in which questions of readiness and skill development are irrelevant, and which, in any case, were the same jobs the youths could have gotten on their own before they went into the counseling, pre-vocational training, and work experience programs.

One final note concerning the use of test scores is in order: two projects identified an important aptitude which seems to be well developed in the disadvantaged youths they tested. Both projects reported that the youths scored well above national norms on tests of manipulative skill. This is a most significant discovery, since it opens an area for productive training and provides a very effective selling point for use in making job placements available to disadvantaged youths. The dismaying thing is that neither project presents any evidence of having done anything with this finding, either in training or in job development. Only a handful of projects collected data to monitor their own processes. It is therefore especially regrettable that the data they did collect appear not to have been used.

Conclusions

That fairly well sums up the projects' use of test results: tests were given, almost ritualistically, but they were seldom actually used for determining admission to the project programs, for counseling, for assignment to training, or for referral to placement. The results of assessment were not effectively communicated to other agencies when appropriate, or to prospective employers when they might have facilitated placement (so as not to make the youth dependent on the agency) and, on the contrary, may have been communicated too freely when they should not have been. Finally, test results revealing some real potentials in the youth were noted but not acted upon. The overall impression left is that the tests were given; the scores recorded in dossiers out of habit, and perhaps to satisfy the curiosity of counselors; and that there their utility ended. It should also be noted that no project made any effort to revise the admittedly ancient norms established for most of the tests listed as being used, with reference to the scores being obtained by youth today.[5]

---

[5] This generally gloomy picture should not obscure the many occasions on which projects have been able to place some individuals in good jobs on the basis of test-revealed talents which had heretofore gone undiscovered. However, even in this respect it was my impression that the talents were more likely to be discovered through other sources (e.g., work try-outs, work sample testing).

Test-Retest Uses

If tests have not been used effectively in assessing the youth served, they have found some utility in program assessment through the use of test-retest designs. In such a program the youth is tested at the beginning of the program (or some phase of it) and then at its conclusion to measure gains made. By inference, the quality and effectiveness of a program designed to produce such gains is therefore tested.

The most common use of such designs was in discovering the effectiveness of basic education or remedial programs concerned with reading and arithmetic, probably because initial and final measures of reading and arithmetic levels are so easy to obtain, providing clear criteria. Six projects tested their programs in these areas by giving objective tests to the youths before and after the program: JOBS, Lorton, MFY, YMCA, PEPSY, and Draper. All but one report gains of at least one year in achievement levels. Another project referred to a two-year gain in one of its reports, and to a lack of gain elsewhere. However, the only data reported document the latter rather than the former claim. In general, the gains reported by the projects are the results of widely different kinds of basic education processes and programs, spanning widely different time periods.

One project tested changes in intelligence test scores, finding a jump in IQ on the Otis test from 95.3 to 108.5 after only a month in the program.

Another program found that self-estimates of physical condition and capacity were more realistic at the end of the program than they were at the beginning, using a specially made self-rating questionnaire. However, no data are presented to indicate how realism was measured.

The Detroit Mayor's Youth Employment Program reports that performance on employment tests was measureably increased after training in test taking, but no data are offered in support of this statement. Presumably the statement refers to a special training program, described elsewhere in the report, which sought to train youths to take and pass the employment test (mostly arithmetic) used by one of the large steel companies in the city. Before the four months of training, most of the test-takers failed the test, making considerably poorer scores than the average high-school graduate (although the Detroit program's youths were almost all high-school graduates themselves). At the end of the program, almost all those who took the test passed, far exceeding the performance level of the average high-school graduate. It was not clear from the report whether the test was taken by the same boys who had failed it initially, and if so, whether the retest was the same form or an alternate form of the test that had been failed initially. Thus in the absence of a control group one cannot tell whether these results are a testimony to the training or to the effect of having familiarity with the test.

In addition to a test-retest of reading, the PEPSY program further evaluated its basic education program by giving pre- and post-tests in other areas: writing an essay on "The Kind of Job I Would Like," an arithmetic budget test, the Revised Beta non-verbal intelligence test, as well as teacher ratings on manners, speech, grooming, and social characteristics. PEPSY does not report the results of these tests, but immediately follows its description of the testing with the statement that four weeks of basic education is obviously too short a time for change to show itself, thus suggesting that it found no changes in test scores to validate the program.

A university-based program used an experimental and control group in dialect training, testing them before and after training on speech samples, articulation tests, intelligence, and English composition. Startlingly, the project report makes no mention of the results, or reference to future analyses, suggesting that the project did not analyze the data, thus failing to honor the very core of its contract to test the utility of dialect-removal in increasing the employability of disadvantaged girls.

Both MFY and Boston's ABCD report much larger gains in reading made by Puerto Rican Spanish-speaking trainees in special classes than for other trainees.

Some observations made by project reports cast doubt on the interpretation of real gains revealed by the pre- and post-test designs. As mentioned earlier, personnel in one project reported their students showed a marked lack of involvement and motivation on the initial testing, but extraordinarily high motivation to demonstrate how well they have learned from training when they took the post-test (possibly because they saw good performance on the post-test as a way to convince the agency that they were job ready). Such a change in motivation could account entirely for the relatively modest score changes reported by the projects. The Draper report also points out that its youths seemed to have "faked bad" on the initial testing in order to demonstrate their need for the program, casting further doubt on the validity of the gains it reports.

The most startling change in scores was one in a midwestern city project in which a thirteen point IQ jump was observed over the period of one month. This is an almost impossible real change, and when one notes that this same project did its initial testing during intake, with relatively little test preparation, a more realistic conclusion would be that the change in scores represents a change in the subjects' approach to the test rather than a real increase in knowledge.

A possible interpretation is that the youths performed at their true levels on the retest, while the initial test scores reflected their anxiety and lack of effort when faced with a test. If this is so, then it might be claimed that the youths had at least learned to take testing seriously and to be motivated to perform well. They should therefore be better able to take and perform well on employment tests. However, this is an argument which rests on the assumption that the motivation, self-confidence, and reduction of anxiety which projects achieved on the post-testing can be generalized to include other testing outside the project. This remains to be seen, although the Detroit steel company experience, if it was truly a test-retest of the same youths on alternate forms of the test, suggests that such a generalization is possible.

A general conslusion from the test-retest studies is that project youths may make modest gains of up to one year in reading and arithmetic achievement after basic education, but it is not yet clear whether these gains are the result of training, or of other factors such as increased motivation, and a dropping away of the "playing it cool" defensiveness on tests. Also it is not clear whether this greater striving on tests can be generalized to testing outside of the project. The results are clearer that special programs for Spanish-speaking youths produce positive improvement in scores.

Test Findings

Many projects report extensive statistical data about their trainees. No effort will be made here to summarize all the characteristics of the youths served by reproducing such data. This section will present only those data which have been derived from psychological assessment and presented in project reports. These results present a remarkably uniform picture.

Eighty-eight percent of the youths tested were below the national average in learning ability and verbal and numerical aptitudes on the GATB (YOB I).

The median IQ on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) was ninety, though it varied somewhat from one corps of trainees to another (YMCA).

Ten percent of the youths were classed as mentally defective on the WAIS, 10 percent as borderline defective, 30 percent as low average, 45 percent as average, and only 3 percent as above average (KEY).

Twenty-five percent were in the average IQ range, and no one was above average (VAS-Altro).

The average IQ on a verbal test was eighty-five; it was ninety-five on a non-verbal test (JOY).

The average IQ on the Lorge-Thorndike was eighty-eight (Detroit).

Four-fifths of the trainees were below 100 in IQ on the WAIS. The largest number were in the average range, but the curve was highly skewed to the low end, with no youths above average (Springfield-Goodwill).

The IQ range on the WAIS was from 90 to 115, largely correlated with reading level. Since reading level tended to be low, so was the average IQ (YOB II).

The youths were well within the average range on the WAIS (in a program that screened out those making low scores) and in the low-average range on the GATB (Kansas City JEVS).

The average score on the Wonderlic Personnel Test was about eleven correct items (JOBS); in Detroit's program, in which 85 percent of the youths were high-school graduates, the average score on the Wonderlic was fourteen.

The average score on the Revised Beta was IQ = ninety (JOBS).

The picture is clear; across the nation, the youths served by the E and D projects tended to score at the low end of the normal range (or a little below) on standard tests of mental ability. Many scored at average on the individually administered WAIS, but the skewing of the curve at the low end reduces the average scores of the groups to below average. Obviously, the projects are dealing with disadvantaged young people.

Outside the area of intelligence, reports of test results are few and far between. One project describes performance on the Draw-A-Person test as one in which females are portrayed as taller, stronger, healthier, and more dominant than males. The males are presented by the youths as passive, small, blind, and appearing dessicated. This description neatly conforms to the current view of the character structure of disadvantaged youths. What is not clear, in the absence of a controlled study, is whether the interpretation of the figures drawn by a youth describes the figures themselves or describes the psychologist's tendency to see such characteristics in drawings which he knows were made by a disadvantaged youth.

The same psychologist reports that in their Thematic Apperception Test stories, the boys reveal a concern with love or the lack of it.

Seventy-one percent of the youths were diagnosed as "inadequate personalities" in one project (Philadelphia JEVS).

Eighty percent had serious emotional problems (VAS-Altro).

Forty percent were recommended for psychiatric evaluation on the basis of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Des Moines).

There were few significant differences between the trainees and a sample of affluent middle-class youths in the problem areas they reported as concerns on the Mooney Problem Check List. Those differences which were found showed the project youths were, understandably enough, more concerned about lack of money and need for economic security than the middle-class youths (Detroit).

The psychiatric picture was of "nonmalignant hostility, antisocial tendencies without the accompanying feelings of guilt, inability to postpone immediate gratifications of needs and confusion in the area of sexual identity" (VAS-Altro)

The impression given by these reports, totally unsupported by the Mooney

Problem Check List study cited above, it that the overwhelming majority of the disadvantaged youths served were seriously emotionally ill. This writer does not agree with these interpretations, and notes that most of the above psychiatric determinations were not made by a qualified psychiatrist. They seem more likely to represent a way of defining the kinds of adaptations to the conditions of their lives made by disadvantaged youths as psychiatric conditions in the youths rather than as quite normal adaptations to a different kind of society and world than that inhabited by the middle class. It is the classic error of defining as pathology any deviations from the standards of the middle class. This is not to say that disadvantaged youths do not exhibit behavior patterns different from those of middle-class youths, and perhaps dysfunctional in middle-class society; rather, it is to assert that such variations are as functional to lower-class life as middle-class behaviors are to middle-class life, and each is dysfunctional to the other. They are not evidence of internal psychiatric illnesses. The above listed psychiatric "charges" are the product of applying an inappropriate frame of reference to the problems of disadvantaged youths. They also illustrate the old notion of finding what you look for. It is not surprising that a high incidence of emotional illnesses were found in those projects which emphasized extensive clinical diagnosis of personality. This position, that joblessness and low employability in lower-class youth represent symptoms of emotional disorder, puts the writer quite out of sympathy with the initial psychiatric orientation of a project cited earlier.

Other assessment findings of interest are:

On the Kuder Preference Record, outdoor interests were the lowest interest areas of the urban California youths seen at Neighborhood House.

There was no significant difference between Performance Scale and Verbal Scale IQ's on the WAIS (Springfield Goodwill and JOBS). This finding adds still more evidence that the customary interpretation of WAIS score patterns, as reflecting the action orientation of disadvantaged youths, has no basis in empirical fact. However, this has been demonstrated many times before, and still makes no difference to WAIS testers, who persist in making the standard interpretation.

Twenty-five percent of a sample of the youths tested could not tell time

(Phila. JEVS). This is a most significant finding, for it may go far to explain the supposed poor time sense and weak ego functioning of disadvantaged youths. I know of no one who has attempted to treat the problem of lateness to work, considered one of the major obstacles to employability of disadvantaged youths, by teaching them to tell time; by making sure that they have a clock available to wake them in the morning; or by measuring the time it takes them to get to work, so that they can plan accordingly.

This finding, by the Philadelphia JEVS, so startling in its simplicity as an explanation for habitual tardiness, suggests another observation, though one not based on objective measurement. It was noted in one project (Pinellas County) that young people often ordered coke and hamburger for dinner in restaurants because the youths knew them to be safe, and simply did not know how to read the menu well enough to order anything else. This observation accords with the writer's own experience. It suggests that one possible reason for the poor food choices customarily made by disadvantaged youths (a problem many projects unsuccessfully attempted to deal with through didactic courses and exhortations to eat balanced meals) is that their guided restaurant experience has been too limited for them to learn to use a menu to order anything but the standard coke and hamburger. This is a theory that can be tested empirically; if confirmed, it suggests an obvious strategy for diet improvement.

One project found a correlation between WAIS and Revised Beta IQ of .70. In another section of its report, it describes this correlation as being higher. The project interprets the correlation to mean that the two tests give essentially equivalent results, thus justifying the use of the Revised Beta as a briefer and more easily administered measure of intelligence. This conclusion is totally unwarranted. Without reflecting on the validity of the Revised Beta independent of the WAIS, it must be pointed out that in the field of intelligence testing, correlations under .90 are generally considered inadequate. The correlation of 70 in fact means that only about half the variance in scores on the Revised Beta can be predicted from WAIS scores. It is a measure of the test naivete of the project that such an interpretation was made.

In general, it may be concluded that little information concerning the characteristics of disadvantaged youths has emerged from testing programs, beyond the reassuring finding that the projects were in fact dealing with the disadvantaged (though how "hard core" they are is another question). The data merely confirm the observation that low intelligence test scores are distributed more heavily in the lower socio-economic class than in the middle-class. The data also point out, however, that even among disadvantaged youths given individual intelligence tests, the most frequent scores are in the average range.

Other findings of potential value are the low outdoor interests (which may go a long way to explain the failure of some of the programs which attempted to train gardeners, landscapers, and other outdoor workers), and the discovery that many disadvantaged youths do not know how to tell time (and probably also lack clocks and watches). Beyond these, there is little of reliable value. The total impression is of slim pickings and a failure to use even those tests which were given to develop new knowledge about disadvantaged youths.

Validity of Tests

Some of the project reports include materials which bear on an estimate of the validity of tests for use with their populations of disadvantaged youths. Even if disadvantaged youths accepted testing, and even if the projects had been able to make use of scores in training and placement, the justification for the use of tests would require some evidence that the tests are valid for the population served.

Among the project findings which bear on an estimate of the validity of tests as predictors are the following:

A "substantial number" of youths who were evaluated as borderline or mentally retarded responded to training or revealed average competences in an industrial work setting (Philadelphia JEVS).

Some counselees who did poorly on the GATB got scores up to thirty points higher on the IPAT (YOB II).

Passage of the vocabulary section of the Armed Forces Qualification Test, which, like other vocabulary tests, is generally considered the best single predictor of intellectual performance, did not discriminate between those boys who later were able to pass the test and those who failed the test again upon retaking it (NCCY).[6]

[6] Project CAUSE II found that its disadvantaged applicants were not as good as others on a regular vocabulary test, but better than others on one of lower-class slang.

These "straws in the wind" suggest that a disadvantaged youth's IQ score is not a stable or reliable predictor of later performance, at least for the criteria with which the E and D projects were concerned. The issue is brought into clear focus by the Federal Department Stores project reported by the Detroit program. In that project, sixteen disadvantaged Negro young adults, who had failed the selection test for salesmen used by Federal Department Stores, were put into a special five-week training program in sales work, grooming, manners, nutrition, and health care, and then employed as sales personnel by Federal despite their low scores. It was found that the trained men came closer to long-term salesmen in volume of sales after five weeks of training than did a group of employees who had passed selection tests and who then had five weeks of experience on the sales floor without the special training. At the time the Detroit report was written, fourteen of the sixteen were still employed at Federal. The report does not mention whether retesting was done after the training and, if so, whether the trainees still scored below standards for selection despite their good actual job performance.

The implications of the experiment are clear: where training was given, the selection test for salesmen was a poor predictor of sales performance for disadvantaged men. Had the test been used exclusively, it would have resulted in the rejection of the disadvantaged Negro applicants and a reduction in sales volume by the stores. This experiment is of such great potential importance that it must be tried again. Indeed, one means by which the Department of Labor might undertake to loosen irrelevant test standards for employment by large employers is to offer to sponsor similar experiments in their companies. For it is likely that the most persuasive argument to an employer is one which shows that his employment standards are not only irrelevant, but that they result in the loss of effective workers.

One final comment on the reliability of test scores: two projects reported greater gaps between the test scores of Spanish-speaking Puerto Rican youths and their work performances than between the test scores and the performance levels of other trainee groups. It is clear that the testing of Spanish-speaking youths is unjustified; the wonder is that anyone ever thought it was.

These relatively slim findings support the writer in his position that most psychological and vocational tests are of no, or only marginal, validity for use with disadvantaged youths. Study of the standardization and validation of many tests in common usage shows that disadvantaged and minority groups are seldom, if ever, represented in the populations on which the tests were standardized or validated and, further, the criterial performance measures used in the validation of the tests seldom bear any empirically demonstrable relation to the job performance in the jobs for which the tests are used as selection instruments. Where there is such a relationship, it is typically with such a low correlation as to result in more mistaken than correct selection decisions, and is not of an order high enough to justify the perpetuation of disadvantagement.

This position is further reinforced by the following project findings.

Certain demographic characteristics of the youths--age, sex, reading level, and education--were better predictors of the type of occupation that a youth would enter than test-derived estimates of employability (Phila. JEVS).

Neither intelligence test scores, grade attainment, reading comprehension, vocabulary level, family income, work attitudes, evaluations of motivation, or ratings of flexibility discriminated between successful (i. e., graduated) trainees and unsuccessful trainees (St. Louis JEVS). In short, none of the psychological characteristics which most E and D projects sought assiduously to measure and develop in the trainees had any relation to whether or not these youths succeeded in the training. The placement figures of the St. Louis project further suggest that being successful as a trainee had little relation to whether or not a youth got a job. One could conclude that ability to get work has nothing to do with the psychological characteristics of youths in E and D projects. These impressions support the position briefly described in the Introduction, that whether or not a youth gets a job has more to do with conditions in the employment marketplace than with conditions in the youths.

The Neighborhood House report says that the most important job requirements for the positions available to the youth in that depressed community were age, size, and education. YOB also found that small size, giving the impression of physical weakness in many trainees of Mexican descent, excluded them from the jobs available.

A somewhat different argument can be made about the use of the GATB as a device for selecting youths for MDTA training. The project reports offer no evidence of the validity of the GATB as a predictor of success in MDTA courses. Supposing that it did have validity for such a purpose, that validity would mean that low-scoring youths should not be referred to such courses, on the assumption that the courses cannot be changed to permit low-scoring youths to learn a skill. But, of course, they can be changed. The logic of the situation is this: if the GATB is valid for the courses as they are, and if disadvantaged youths tend to score below standards on the GATB, then there two choices--maintain the courses as they are and screen out disadvantaged youths, or change the courses so that low scorers on the GATB will profit from them. As MDTA is the only national training resource for disadvantaged youths, the choice is obvious. If this means a change in the current structure of MDTA training, then that should be possible to arrange.

Thus the writer is led to the following conclusions. First, that the validity of tests for predicting the job success of disadvantaged youths is yet to be established, and the weight of the evidence suggests that such validity will not be found. Second, that psychological characteristics of the kind measured by ability and interest tests do not seem to play a role in whether or not a youth gets a job and, finally, that if tests are valid as predictors of success in MDTA training, this should be taken as a directive to change the characteristics of MDTA training.

There is a curious logical development in connection with the kinds of jobs which projects find available for their youths. In some projects, which noted that youths scored low on tests as well as other assessments, it was therefore concluded that the most suitable jobs for such youths, and the only ones they could expect to get, were entry-level manual labor or routine factory jobs. Thus their job development staffs emphasized such jobs, and the staff was glad to have them available. But when these were the jobs that the youths were offered, and the youths either refused them, quit them, or found them too worthless to bother getting up in the morning for, it was concluded that the youths were not job ready, and this was taken as further evidence that little more than such jobs could possibly be expected for them. In such circumstances, the tests whose scores led to the initial characterization of the youths as too untalented for worthwhile jobs were quite useless as measures of anything related to job success, since the jobs made available to the youths did not demand any particular skills or aptitudes. This kind of development thus produced a self-fulfilling prophecy, in that the youths found no reason to be motivated for such jobs, thus confirming the original characterization. Too few projects were able to make good, respectable jobs available to their youths to test the alternative proposition--that rather than the lack of motivation of disadvantaged youths affecting the kinds of jobs they can get, it may be the other way around--that the kinds of jobs which the youths find available to them are no incentive to motivate them. Were these good jobs, many of these young people would make the effort.

As will be pointed out later in this report, there is reason for thinking that the motivation of disadvantaged youths is more responsive to incentive conditions than middle-class internalized motivations; it may be this characteristic which makes disadvantaged youths appear unmotivated when there is nothing to be motivated for. The mistake may be to assume that the availability of a worthwhile incentive would not elicit the motivation. Yet the single greatest failure of the E and D projects was that they sought to produce motivationally-relevant changes in the youths without changing the incentives to which the youths were expected to respond. If vocational tests have little or no useful validity as predictors of the job success of disadvantaged youths, some projects have been able to show a very bright ray of light: MFY reports that those who successfully completed training in the skills recommended for them on the basis of work sample testing was 87 percent. This figure is considerably higher than the 46 percent of youths who completed their OJT in that project and compares very favorably with MDTA training statistics, which show disadvantaged youths finishing their courses successfully in less than 50 percent of the cases and show non-disadvantaged adults with a completion rate of about 70 percent. Thus work sample testing may be far more effective than traditional vocational assessments. Further support is provided by the YMCA project, in which it was found that after the vocational instructors developed some work sample tests to be given to trainees before they selected their occupational specialty, there was a marked reduction in program-switching and dissatisfaction. Unfortunately, that project does not provide supporting data for these observations. Nevertheless, work sample testing, as used by these and other projects, appears to be one of the most successful innovations in assessment to come out of the E and D projects; it will be treated in more detail in a later section of this report.

Clinical Assessment

Six projects used an essentially clinical approach to assessment, although these varied in their professionalism from the full psychiatric casework treatment initially employed in two projects, through the attempt by Lane County to give the social workers an objective base on which to make their intake judgments, to two projects which paid such scant attention to assessment that it was based on nothing more than a single interview by an untrained interviewer.

In the more elaborate clinical assessment programs, such as Springfield Goodwill, there were social work interviews, use of past records from schools and police and other social agencies to which the client was known, psychological testing, and home visits and interviews with parents. Springfield Goodwill also included a routine psychiatric interview. In the case of PEPSY, referrals were made to psychiatrists when indicated. PAL referred 20 percent of its clients for a full clinical psychological evaluation and individual clinical test interpretations of personality and ego functioning.

It is not surprising that the projects that used such a clinical approach were those largely organized and operated by social service agencies, with staffs made up of social workers who attempted to transfer wholesale the techniques and procedures of family service agencies to the E and D project. It is not surprising that, in most of these cases, the very detailed and expensive clinical assessment contributed little of vocational value or relevance to the youths and, in most agencies, made no difference in the kind of training given or the kinds of placements arranged.

However, the highly individualized approach of such agencies did result in supportive services beyond those in most other agencies. Indeed, the social workers in the clinical agencies devoted more of their attention to medical, dental, and family problems than they did to more direct vocational matters. The clinical approach was effective and helpful to the extent that the youths served received such supportive services. However, the issue mentioned in the Preface concerning the limits of demonstration must be faced. It is this writer's judgment that an E and D project should have exemplary staff and resources, so that it does an excellent job, and it must have the talent to be able to conceptualize, test, and communicate its experiences. However, if the project is to demonstrate anything useful the forms of those experiences should be such that once demonstrated, others less competent may imitate them. In this respect, an E and D project which offers a kind of service requiring scarce personnel and a great deal of time and effort which could not possibly be built into a national program, is not demonstrating anything useful to the nation. Therefore, an intensely clinical approach requiring highly trained psychologists and psychiatrists is inappropriate, even if of proven effectiveness. Further, the clinical approach with its emphasis on the total life situation of the disadvantaged youths, goes beyond the appropriate concern of a manpower program for the vocational lives of people into realms which, however important to the national health and welfare, are the concern of other institutions. It is enough that a manpower program may have to replace the educational institutions for vocational training; to attempt take over social welfare is to bite off too much.

In any case, the efficacy of the clinical approach in producing behavioral change has not yet been empirically demonstrated, and what evidence there is does not support claims of effectiveness. One report does suggest that the very close and continuing relationship established between caseworkers and clients continued far beyond the clients' period of training. While such extensive follow-up is desirable from a counseling point of view, the project has not achieved a particularly good record of vocational stability and productivity, and the case studies suggest that in fact a dependency relationship between caseworkers and clients was actively fostered by the caseworkers, who took a very maternal stance. Indeed, it would appear that those clients who would not tolerate such dependency were the ones who dropped out of the program. The report cites later courtships, marraiges, and childbirths of girls who had once been in the training program--surely matters which are beyond the responsibility or legitimate interest of an employability-development agency.

The Lane County program attempted to give an objective base to its clinical inferences and developed a rating check list for use by the intake social worker. In the Lane County program, a client was referred by the intake worker directly to vocational counseling if: (1) the client was able to communicate thoughts to the intake worker; (2) he showed evidence of having future goals; (3) he showed evidence of having made some plans or efforts to implement his goals; (4) he was neat and clean in his appearance; (5) he appeared to be self-confident and independent; and (6) there had been past attempts to work. Clients were referred to pre-vocational training if they displayed the following behavior: (1) a hesitation in answering questions; (2) giving monosyllabic answers; (3) giving no answers or information about himself; (4) having no job information; (5) having no vocational plans, or very unrealistic plans; (6) having no plans for implementing his vocational goals; (7) making a poor appearance; (8) having little or no work experience; and (9) having maturity problems (picking nose or teeth during the interview, over-reactive laughing or giggling).

The program of a midwestern project was initially the most clinical of them all. According to this project's reports, they felt that individualized evaluation procedures precluded any standard test battery. The project attempted instead to interpret the life style of each client, to characterize his attitudes toward employment, toward his family, toward his peers, and toward himself. Included were an assessment of ego strengths and weaknesses, strengths of past relationships, and the presence of internal conflicts which might affect adaptation to work and the development of intimacy with others. Their aim was to construct a complete psychiatric diagnosis. It is amazing that a program for the disadvantaged apparently aimed so high that it expected to develop a higher level of mental health than is required of employed workers, many of whom are permitted by their employers to have internal conflicts, to work on factory assembly lines without developing intimacies with others, and who remain employed despite arguments with wives and parents.

In brief, the scope of intervention envisaged by this and other projects of similar orientation went far beyond the needs of the client for employability, to the point where the private lives of needy clients were invaded without warrant, and without the freedom to reject the invasion. This evaluation would be different if those agencies using such clinical approaches were able to demonstrate good placement and job tenure effects. Unfortunately, they were no more successful than the non-clinical agencies which specifically excluded personality and home life matters.

Two problems developed which affected the clinical assessment programs. The first was the cumbersomeness and expense of the undertaking. Two projects found that the length of time required for such an individualized program and assessment was not justified by the contributions made by the assessment. They found that they would not be able to serve as many youths as they were committed to serving without streamlining. Many clients who demanded and needed prompt service dropped out because of the long assessment intake. The provision of prompt service is one of the foremost requirements for program effectiveness in dealing with disadvantaged youths. If two well-funded local projects could not make the clinical assessment model work well for themselves, how much more inappropriate would such a model be for a national program? If it is so inappropriate for a national program, what sense is there in demonstrating such a model of service?

A second problem, which was illustrated in four project reports, was a failure of communication which developed between those taking the depth psychiatric approach to assessment and those program personnel charged with responsibility for vocational training, guidance, and placement. One report mentions the difficulty of translating clinical assessment concepts into terms understandalbe to the more vocationally and job-oriented project staff. A joint social work-vocational counseling program reported difficulty in communication between the two types of agencies. It was apparent in another project that the project psychologist was talking at a different level from the rest of the staff. These projects seem to have experienced some internal dissension, which became clinical assessment vs. rapid intake focused on vocational considerations. The writer suspects that one reason for the difficulty in translating the language of depth psychology and social work into the language of vocational guidance, training, and job placement is this language does not in fact have much to do with vocational planning and development. The communication problem is a symptom of the assessment's irrelevance.

Therefore, it can be said that when social workers are in charge of intake, psychologists do testing, counselors are in charge of vocational guidance, and former businessmen or employment service placement interviewers manage placement, there are bound to be internal conflicts. Procedural and language differences rapidly become confounded with professional identities. The lines of resistance are hardened and differences of opinion about procedures are converted into threats to the professional identity of each staff member. Three projects reported that this occurred in inter-agency communications but most often the conflicts seem to have been intra-agency, most notably between market-oriented palcement personnel and youth-oriented social workers and counselors. This breakdown in the "team approach" is especially likely in E and D projects which begin on a crash basis, have no traditions of working together, have no comfortable role structures for their staff, and have too little time to engage in adequate staff development activities in which the various roles could become clarified.

Two agencies eventually altered their approaches to assessment because of these problems. In one, the alteration was accompanied by staff upheaval and the resignation of the social work staff identified with the clinical intake. It is noteworthy that this project's proposal had promised a continuous review and development of assessment methods, techniques, and tools, but the agency's structure was so ill-adapted for such a continuous review that when change came at all, it involved a purge of staff and a good deal of internal turmoil. The agency's structure was not at all appropriate for the kind of commitment it had made in its contract with OMAT, suggesting that the agency expected its promised "continuous review" would confirm the type of assessment the staff was prepared to do.

The changes made by the other project were more smoothly accomplished, essentially substituting group intake for the progressive sieve-like clinical assessment with which the project had started.

Homemade Tests

Twelve projects used project-constructed tests and measurements to fill specific needs in their operations. Some of these may be useful in other settings, despite their lack of standardization and validation. Others seem so promising that OMPER should sponsor their perfection.

The most promising homemade test is a picture interest test developed by Draper (which was surely one of the most creative of the E and D projects). Although the test is only sketchily described in the otherwise complete Draper report, it apparently consists of pictures of people in various occupational roles. The test-taker apparently indicates his preferences among the pictures. Considering that two projects found the Kuder Preference Record too far advanced for their disadvantaged and functionally illiterate youths, as noted earlier, there is an apparent need for a nonverbal vocational interest test. OMPER would be well-advised to underwrite the costs of research on the instrument.

The Vocational Advisory Service also used some of its own tests, including a test of vocational interest and an information questionnaire. However, the project reports give no descriptions of these instruments or indications of their utility.

Other tests developed by E and D projects include an achievement test for group administration to replace the more cumbersome Wide Range Achievement Test (although there are group achievement tests on the market [YOB II]); typing, spelling, and dictation proficiency tests (YOB II); and two measures of attitudes toward the world of work (Lane County). PEPSY developed two tests for the test-retest study of its basic education program, an essay on "The Kind of Job I Would Like" and an arithmetic-budget test.

Several projects used homemade reading and arithmetic tests, usually given at intake, to provide a rapid estimate of the need for basic education (Neighborhood House, Kansas City JEVS, KEY). Neighborhood House felt that its test provided a starting point that made involvement in counseling sessions easier, as it gave the youths something to talk about, deal with, and make plans for. Kansas City JEVS had its youths read a section from a newspaper as its reading test.

KEY constructed an informal arithmetic test; they then compared a youth's performance on the test with the kinds of mathematics required for successful performance of the occupation for which he was being trained. They were thus able to make basic education specific to the youth's occupational needs. Draper used the same approach, and both projects represent an advance over the assumption that all occupations require a certain core level of mathematics competence. It is not sufficient simply to teach mathematics, though of course that helps; the further step is to teach only those concepts that the student himself can recognize a need for in his occupational training, rather than using the occupational training to sell him a bill of goods beyond his needs. If the KEY test is really useful in this fashion, and can be readily objectified, it should be further developed and can make a significant contribution as an assessment tool.

Other measuring devices included an "Employability Profile" (Skills Center); speech hearing, and articulation tests used in the research program of Temple University; a check list of behavioral characteristics from which assignment to prevocational training or to counseling can be made (Lane County); an estimate of physical capacity and condition (Phila. JEVS); and several rating scales to be used by the employers and the families of released trainees in follow-up (Draper). These last seem to be rather well thought-out questionnaires.

The National Commission on Children and Youth used a device in test form as a teaching-counseling technique. Called the "Can You Take Directions? Test" it consists of instructions for a number of nonsensical operations, including saying embarrassing things publicly. If the youths follow the directions, however, they find that they don't have to do these things. If they fail to follow the directions, they find themselves doing a lot of silly things publicly, and others are aware that they have failed to follow the directions. It is an amusing device, and could make the point effectively, if the youths do not become too embarrassed.

In sum, most of the tests developed by the projects were of a practical nature; and few are likely to be useful outside the projects. The number of projects using informal estimates of reading and arithmetic skills suggests a need for some rapid short-form tests in the area, however, and JOBS reports a need for a brief personality test which will alert staff to needs for referrals to psychotherapy.

The picture vocational interest test, the mathematics test geared to comparison of achievement to the needs of several occupations, possibly the behavioral checklist of the Lane County project, and the follow-up ratings of the Draper project, deserve further development and testing.

Work Experience Ratings

Many projects employed work experience stations for their youths either in-house, as in work crews; by farming the youths out to work stations in public agencies; or in regular on-the-job training (OJT). However, no project report gives any particular form for evaluation of the youth's performance in work experience stations. Most assessment seems to have been done informally ("J. T. is working along nicely now") and without detailed or complete evaluation. The E and D projects seem to have relied on the assumed experience and competence of the work crew supervisors, or the heads of work stations to which the youths were assigned. In most cases this assumption was unwarranted. Many project reports mention dissatisfaction with the supervision the youths received in out-of-house placements. The YMCA program attempted to solve this problem by having its counselors interview each supervisor at least once a week, but this was a huge drain on the counselors' time. MFY found that supervision of OJT seemed to be better in large companies, which had experience in supervising and evaluating apprentices as part of their normal operations, as the small employers were too informal and inexperienced. Some projects reported that the office supervisors in public agencies providing work experience for their youths generally ignored the youths and did not know what to do with them, except for sending them on little errands. Such agencies failed to provide the young people with enough actual and varied work experience to be able to make any kind of reasonable assessment of their skills, style, competence, or interest. Of course, it need hardly be pointed out that the only thing a youth learns in such an office is how to not work, rather the opposite of the program's intentions.

Some work experience stations involved such low-level routine tasks that they did not lend themselves to any detailed evaluation of a youth's skills, interests, or needs. This was the case with several work crews that were essentially manual-labor forces. It was simply not possible, with such a restricted range of tasks, to make the assessment of work habits, work tolerance, and ability to accept supervision that the assessment staff wanted.

When the work station is limited in the range of activities on which observations can be made, the tendency is to deal with generalized work attitudes and other abstract aspects of the worker role (such as response to supervision) which may be separated from the tasks in which they are manifested. This raises a further problem. It is generally assumed that such worker-role characteristics (punctuality, attendance, work tolerance, cooperativeness, etc.) are character traits, regardless of the work the boy is being asked to do. This assumption is highly questionable. One could make an equally good case for the hypothesis that a youth's punctuality, attendance, work habits, and work tolerance will be related to the interest and gratification he gets out of the particular job he is doing, and this gratification would be expected to vary from job to job, perhaps even from supervisor to supervisor. This is a crucial matter. Many of the programs, operating on the assumption that playing the role of a worker can be abstracted from the kind of work being done regardless of the kind of jobs offered to the youths, become dubious. The assumption of generalized work traits seems particularly false for disadvantaged youths, which may be why those projects which were able to hold up desirable jobs as goals to their youths (YMCA is an outstanding example) showed relatively little anxiety over teaching youths how to play work roles and the other paraphernalia of "prevocational training."

Three comments from project reports also suggest this position: the Pinellas County program reports that its youths often behaved very differently toward the residential staff members than they did toward their MDTA instructors or work supervisors, sometimes looking like entirely different boys and girls to the professionals who saw them in different contexts. One JOBS staff member wrote that "some can be great employees and lousy trainees, and vice versa." Finally, the Philadelphia JEVS noted that when the work try-out period was ended and the youths were given industrial tasks with salaries, their work output and motivation increased greatly, indicating that these youths were quite sensitive to incentives. There is reason for thinking that the behavior displayed by a youth in a particular work experience station may be a function of the conditions of that work station, rather than of enduring traits in the youth, and thus cannot necessarily be generalized about his attitude toward work in the abstract.

The assumption that work habits can be generalized for disadvantaged youths underlies much programming in E and D projects, and yet it is highly questionable. But it is an assumption that can be empirically tested by psychological research in a variety of not very complicated experimental designs. It is strongly recommended that OMPER sponsor such experiments. It is crucial to the evaluation of the validity and utility of work-role training and assessment, whether it is through assignment to work crews, through group counseling, through prevocational training instruction, or through assignment to work experience stations. Despite the questionable status of this assumption, some projects were able to develop work experiences of sufficient variety and complexity to permit meaningful description and assessment of the youths' performances, even if the descriptions and assessments are not generalizable to other work sites. The common ingredient in these projects is that the work stations were in-house and supervised by trained staff (YMCA, Springfield Goodwill, Skills Center, and the three JEVS projects). At the Springfield Goodwill project, supervisors made daily reports on each youth, using ratings in specific areas: attitudes toward work; output; ability to respond to pressures for more output, effort, or better work; concept of self as a worker; attendance; conformity to work rules; skills; and personal behavior. No doubt the sheltered workshop experience of this project provided it with the background to carry this off. Sheltered workshop experience alone, however, is apparently not sufficient. Supervisory staff and foremen must also be trained specifically for working with disadvantaged youths and must receive professional support and consultation. When this was not done there was considerably more difficulty in getting good evaluations from supervisors.

The Philadelphia JEVS had a carefully stated set of criteria which defined the goals of its two levels of training, and therefore the standards of promotion from the lower to the higher level. Training at the lower level was aimed at the social aspects of the work role: observing rules, grooming, respect for authority, and acceptable interpersonal behavior. When supervisors' evaluations indicated that these objectives had been achieved by a youth, he was promoted to a second level at which work tempo, task persistence, coordination and dexterity, output competition, quality, and quantity of task performance were the objects of training and assessment (i.e., the production aspects of the work role). It is interesting to note that, in a sense, the ordering of these aspects of the work role was reversed by the YMCA program, which devoted itself to the skill or production aspects of the work, and found that the other aspects either took care of themselves, or were learned informally as part of the practice shop experience.

The St. Louis JEVS also used extensive supervisory evaluations in its sheltered workshop. This program had the added distinction of being the only one that sought to establish some validity for these ratings. They found that ratings of motivation, flexibility, or work habits did not correlate with whether or not a trainee was classified as successful (i.e., graduated from the program). However, supervisors' ratings of cooperativeness did have a barely significant relationship to success, though not, apparently, to job placement.

CPI, ABCD, JOBS, Neighborhood House, YMCA, and the Skills Center do not report any extensive or formal use of their work experience settings for providing assessments. They were more training-oriented in their use of work experience, and assessment seems to have been at an informal level.

Probably the worst situation of all was that of a project in Appalachia, in which strained relationships between the project and MDTA personnel resulted in the refusal of the MDTA staff to provide the project with any assessments of trainee progress or even an estimate of the trainee's likely completion date, effectively leaving the project in the dark and hurting the youths.

In summary, assessment of work experience performance, except in some of the sheltered workshop settings, was generally not satisfactory in the E and D projects. The problems seem to be: an inability to construct adequate assessments by untrained and out-of-house supervisors; a too restricted range of work experience to provide enough data for assessment; a lack of demonstrated reliability or validity in the formal rating procedures used; a failure by most projects to use formal ratings or assessments (only three or four of the more than sixteen projects which had work experience programs described formal ratings in their reports); and the questionable assumption that performance in a work experience station can be generalized to performance on other kinds of jobs, in other settings, under other incentive conditions, and with different supervisors. Finally, when projects did not adequately train supervisors, provide them with guidance and direction, had no administrative control over them, or they worked in settings having very different orientations and goals from the E and D project, there was little useful assessment of the trainees.

Work Samples

In the context of a general failure to use psychological and vocational testing productively with disadvantaged youths, or to deal with any sophistication with the issues of assessment, it becomes a pleasure to describe what is clearly the outstanding innovation in assessment developed by the E and D program. Work sample testing is a close ally in the assessment of work experience, except, in work sample testing, the work tasks are specifically designed for assessment purposes rather than teaching or skill-training purposes. It is thus understandable that, like work experience programs, work sample testing seems to have been done most often by vocational rehabilitation agencies with sheltered workshop experience.

Ten programs used work sample techniques in one way or another. They varied widely in the elaborateness of their development from simply trying out Spanish-speaking youths on a number of workroom tasks as a substitute for aptitude and interest tests (VAS-Altro), to the highly formalized methods of MFY and Philadelphia JEVS. One program had promised to develop work sampling, in its contract proposal to OMAT, but did not, in fact, do so.

Among those making relatively minor, or informal, use of work samples were the Skills Center, which simply allowed youths ineligible for their program to try themselves out on shop tasks in the Skills Center for a week, without pay, while they were working with the job development staff. In that context, the work sampling was largely for self-assessment purposes, and an opportunity to discover interests.

The YMCA use of informal work samples to provide youths with an opportunity to make a realistic choice between the two kinds of skill training available in the program has been mentioned. It was reported that the decisions made by the youths after work sampling greatly reduced program switching. The Draper project made a similar use of samples in their training curricula by exposing youths to several classes from each curriculum before the youth decided the kind of skill training he wanted. Draper also stressed the self-assessment aspect of the sampling. Through the use of a self-assessment form, each youth rated aspects of each skill, so that he could be sure that he understood all relevant considerations before he made his decision.

JOBS vocational instructors also developed some crude work samples, but used them more as vocational achievement measures than as measures of aptitudes or interests.

MFY tried to use its work experience stations as work samples, by rotating youths through the various work stations before making an assignment to skill training. However, MFY found that this was not a satisfactory arrangement, probably because the youths did not see their rotations through the work stations as an opportunity for self-assessment, but rather as jobs or as training per se. They did not like being rotated to the next work station before they felt they had acquired any competence in the skills of the one that they were on. They found it discouraging to be pulled out of each work station before they had developed any mastery of the work. It was this situation which led MFY to develop a regular vocational evaluation center, built around work sample testing, to be described in more detail below.

Like MFY before the establishment of its vocational evaluation center, one of the sheltered workshop programs rotated youths through its several work training stations, with each youth spending three or four days in each location. However, according to the evaluation report by Catholic University's Bureau of Social Research, there was no objective evaluation of the work samples, no consistent pattern of supervision, and little supervision of the youths while they were on the work sites. The evaluation further charges that the work at the work stations was at too low a level to permit any assessment of skill and aptitude, that the work stations were in occupations for which there was little hope of employment, and that, in any case, the selection of a skill training field after the work sampling was based entirely on the youth's choice, rather than on evaluation of his potential effectiveness as determined by his performance during the sampling.

Kansas City JEVS also used shop work for informal, and relatively crude, work sampling, but without systematic development of the samples or evaluation of performance.

Four projects made major applications of work sample techniques and developed them to a relatively high level. These were Springfield Goodwill, St. Louis JEVS, MFY, and Philadelphia JEVS. The last two represent the highest development among the E and D projects, consisting of the major innovations in assessment to emerge from the E and D program.

The St. Louis JEVS report does not give a very precise definition of its work sampling methods. It does describe providing the trainee with brief instruction and time for practice before the actual test was run. When the trainee indicated his readiness, the formal test was administered. The evaluation of performance seems to have been more crude than in MFY and Philadelphia JEVS, and does not seem to have had any quantification of performance or the application of norms. Rather, performance was described in informal terms. According to the project's report, the trainees used the work samples as reality situations which defined the salient performance characteristics of various kinds of jobs, thus making their vocational planning more realistic, and giving them a reality on which to base their vocational interests. Unfortunately, St. Louis JEVS does not describe the nature of the work tasks involved in their samples, except for a work sample of photo finishing, which was described as a remarkably good indicator of aptitude, correlating markedly with evidence of success in photo finishing training. However, no data accompany the assertion, and the absence of an exact numerical statement of the correlation suggests that the term was not being used in its exact empirical sense, and that the asserted relationship was only estimated.

Springfield Goodwill used detailed ratings of performance on work samples, and makes reference to sheltered workshop and industrial norms, suggesting that performance is quantified and can be compared to some kinds of score distributions. It is noted that the youth in the Springfield program received no pay while going through work sample evaluation. No reference is made to reliability or validity of the ratings made by the work sample evaluation, or of the quantitative scores obtained.

The MFY work sample procedures are adaptations of the well-known Tower system developed for use with handicapped persons. In the MFY program, counselors refer youths to the vocational evaluation center for a two-week period. During the first week, the youth tries a number of work samples. During the second week he is given a chance for more extended practice on those samples on which he showed promise, permitting him to improve his performance. At the end of the second week, a complete report and evaluation, including a recommendation for skill training, is forwarded to the youth's counselor. MFY reports that the recommendation of the center is followed in almost all of the cases, though it is not binding on the counselor or the youth. They find that eighty-seven percent of those placed in the recommended training program complete their work successfully. This figure is much higher than that of trainees who have not had work sample evaluation, and represents impressive success for work sample testing.

In the MFY system, each work sample is treated as a set of subtests with increasing levels of difficulty and complexity. Each can be scored objectively for time and number of errors. The samples are structured along industrial lines, (i.e., the samples are "bits" of occupations, the plumbing sample, for example, consists of pipe measurements and the use of different lengths and shapes of pipes to construct a lay-out according to a blueprint, the carpentry sample includes cutting wood and assembling the pieces to construct an object according to a plan), rather than work representations of psychomotor skills. This distinction will become clearer when the Philadelphia JEVS work samples are described.

While working on the work samples at MFY, a trained and experienced supervisor rates the youth's work habits, work tolerance, ability to accept supervision, ability to complete a task even when frustrated by lack of skill, concentration, punctuality, and attendance.

It is not clear from the MFY reports how well standardized the work sample procedures are. The testing is done on two floors of an old loft building, in a relatively crowded space. It seems likely that each youth's performance on a particular test would be influenced by how busy the shop was during the time in which he was learning to perform the task prior to the actual testing and by the noise and other environmental conditions prevailing during the test (such as having all the necessary tools always kept in the same standard order for all subjects, so that time scores are not adversely affected by searches for tools or interruptions from other workers). The MFY report does not make clear whether score distributions for various kinds of workers are available to provide a basis for comparing a particular youth's performance. It is the writer's impression that much in the MFY system rests on the good sense, experience, and judgment of the evaluation supervisor. Although this was to be expected during a period of rapid exploration and development further standardization and validation must be done if the system is to be perfected so that it can be used by other agencies with comparable and interchangeable results.

In the Philadelphia JEVS system, work samples are also graded from the simple to the complex within each series, with each higher level requiring broader psychological participation by the subject through the use of covert cognitive processes. The basic tasks in each series appear to be fairly unitary in the psychomotor skills involved (i.e., assembling nuts and bolts of various sizes, sorting washers of various sizes), although there is also some overlap among industrial lines. For example, there is some overlap between the assembly of electrical materials and the assembly of non-electrical objects. This feature provides an opportunity for a refinement of measurement which the Philadelphia project has not attempted: it should be possible to find several tasks requiring about the same psychomotor skills, but differing in their industrial application. There might be three or four basic simple finger dexterity and manipulation tasks in which one comes from the needle trades, one from the electrical industry, and one from another line of work. In such a series, with the psychomotor components identified through factor analytic studies, a subject's average score on the tasks would define his level of finger dexterity, while differences in score among the tasks might provide an indication of the industrial line in which he has an interest, on the assumption that the one in which he is most interested (i.e., most motivated) is the one on which he gives his best performance. For each subject one could derive a score on a particular psychomotor skill by averaging his performance on all the tasks involving that skill, and an independent score on interest by averaging performances on all tasks from the same industrial line. In such a way, the work sample technique can be broadened to provide a greater range of objective information without violating the essential feature of being a performance measure identical to the performances required in the world of work.

It is an important feature of the Philadelphia JEVS technique that an estimate is made of the subject's level of performance, so that he can start on the graded series at a level at which he can perform well. This feature recognizes the importance of success experiences in testing to disadvantaged youths.

Like the MFY program, the JEVS technique included practice periods before the actual testing. As in MFY, there does not seem to have been much standardization of these practice periods or the conditions of test administration.

Inasmuch as the JEVS program included a sheltered workshop to which the youths were assigned after work sample testing, the program had a fine opportunity to test the validity of the work samples by running simple correlations between speed and accuracy scores on the work samples and speed and accuracy scores on the several industrial tasks the youths performed in the sheltered workshop. It is especially regrettable that this was not done.

There are several reasons for thinking that when fully developed, the work sample technique will be extremely valuable. (1) It is non-verbal. (2) It involves performances identical to those required in work. It is a generally supported empirical principle in test construction that the closer the test items are to the criterion in form and content, the more likely that the items will be valid. Thus the identity between test and work criteria promises high validity for the work samples. (3) The obvious relevance of the test to work makes the test appear sensible and therefore acceptable to test-suspicious youth, who are therefore likely to be well-motivated to perform on it. (4) The closeness of the test to actual work performance makes it a comprehensive measure, including within it all the psychological and performance factors which operate on the job. Thus the test is likely to be a better predictor than those tests which isolate some presumably central skill or aptitude (e.g., spatial relations) for testing, leaving other variables of interest, motivation, perception, eye-hand coordination, and transfer to industrial situations as uncontrolled variables. (5) The work sample technique makes such apparent good sense that it should be particularly attractive to employers, making it easier to "sell" a youth to a job opening on the basis of objective measures of his ability to perform tasks identical to those required by the job. In this way, the use of work sample testing could do much to erode the non-functional and often irrelevant selection testing done by many employers, which too often screen out disadvantaged youths. It is surprising that neither MFY nor JEVS make mention of using work sample scores as recommendations to employers. (6) The obvious relevance of the work samples should help disadvantaged youths make accurate self-assessments of their vocational skills, thus serving as a motivator for training. In contrast, such youths often have difficulty in understanding the relevance of a score on one of the standard paper and pencil tests, because the performance they gave on the test seems, to them, so far removed from work performance. (7) Finally, the work samples provide youths of limited occupational experience, and little knowledge of what is involved in various occupations, with a firm reality on which to base their self-assessments of interest, and also provide their image of occupations and work careers with a concrete base.

These are impressive considerations and promise much for work sample testing. However, there are yet many problems to be solved.

How generalizable are performances on work samples to performances under regular conditions of regular work, under industrial supervision, and with monetary incentive? It was noted that the work sample testing at JEVS and Springfield Goodwill was done without stipends to the youths. MFY's report does not mention whether or not there were stipends. As indicated earlier, JEVS noted that when the youths completed the work sample evaluations and were put on industrial tasks with pay, their behavior and performance markedly improved. It was also noted that the productivity of the youths tended to keep pace with the periodic salary raises which the JEVS project gave its workers in the sheltered workshop. It is possible that some youths are affected by financial incentive more than others. The absence of incentive in work sample tests would elicit performances from these youths which are inferior to their performances under incentive conditions. This would affect their relative standing vis-a-vis the youths who are less affected by level of incentive and who tend to give maximum performance without regard to availability of incentives. There is a need for psychological research in which disadvantaged youths' performances on various tasks under varying conditions of incentive could be examined for the effect of differences among incentive conditions, and for differences between disadvantaged and middle-class youths in responsiveness to incentive, the hypothesis to be tested being that disadvantaged youths' performances are more responsive to levels of incentive than middle-class youths, and that disadvantaged youths are more responsive to financial incentive, compared to social incentives, than middle-class youths.

How reliable are the ratings of work sample performance? Are the ratings affected by how long the youth was permitted to practice the task before the actual testing? Are they affected by the relationship between the supervisor and the youth? Do different observers make different evaluations?

Are work samples measures of aptitude or achievement? Are scores affected by amount of past practice or work experience on similar tasks? If so, it would be unfair to use them for selective placement, unless specific norms for various groups of test takers are used, for that would mean that disadvantaged youths would tend to get lower scores than experienced workers.

Are they valid? Do successful workers in a particular occupation get higher scores on the work samples related to that occupation than they do on work samples unrelated to their occupation, and do they get higher scores on related work samples than unsuccessful workers? One must attend to the possibility of self-fulfilling prophesy operating here. It is possible that a youth who scores well on a work sample is seen, therefore, as one with high potential. When he is then placed in a related industrial production task, under a supervisor who already sees him as having high potential, the supervisor's level of expectation for the youth will be raised,and, at the same time, his expectation of good performance should lead to selective perception of high achievement by the youth. The youth is likely to sense the level of expectation (as psychological research has shown, people do tend to try to approximate the standards held for them) and thus perform at a higher level than those for whom there are lower standards of expectation. He is also likely to feel encouraged by the implied approval of his work, so that he works even harder. Through a process like this, it is possible that the work sample testing may be less a device for predicting success than it is a device for producing job success in some workers. One might conclude that if it is, it is a desirable technique. However, a self-fulfilling prophecy can operate in both directions, and with disadvantaged youths in the schools, it has more often acted against them than for them. There is a need to clarify this issue.

Until these issues are settled, the work sample technique will remain an innovation of great but unrealized potential, and its adoption as a standard tool in the technology of vocational guidance and placement would not be justified.

Self-Assessment

Although few programs specifically encouraged self-assessment, many included self-assessment activities.

In a four-day group-counseling program for MDTA trainees, the trainees discussed their test scores in a kind of self-confrontation within the group. It was felt that the group members were less likely to permit members to rationalize away or ignore the test findings, and group puncturing of defenses was said to be more acceptable to the youths than the puncturing of a professional (Action Housing).

One project used interest inventories and other questionnaires to stimulate self-appraisal, including a questionnaire on job readiness which the youths filled out for themselves, and the staff filled out for them. The youths then compared their estimate of their job readiness with the staff's estimate. This process was used after the youths had been in the project for some time and had established a relationship with program personnel (KEY).

The Draper program used a form on which trainees rated themselves in relation to various training areas available in the project, thus stimulating a realistic appraisal of the various alternatives. Before filling out the form, the youth was exposed to each of the training curricula, and heard talks about career potential, salaries, and working conditions in each.

In the Davis Goodwill program, the youths used their three- to-four day placements in the various training areas to discover their own interests.

One program reported that if clients took an informal reading and arithmetic test during intake, they subsequently were more involved in counseling. This suggests that the tests stimulated the kind of self-assessment which leads directly to counseling (Neighborhood House).

The New Jersey OEO program had youths fill out several self-assessment inventories as part of the group guidance program. The youths then discussed their responses in the groups.

The Syracuse Skills Center allowed ineligible applicants to work in the Skills Center for a week to discover their own interests while they also met daily with job developers and counselors to make placement decisions.

The PAL program, and to some extent Neighborhood House, used temporary, short-term, and part-time placements as self-assessment devices for those youths who either overestimated themselves and thus saw no value in counseling and training or who wanted to try themselves out on a job to test the validity of their own self-appraisals. By working on a job which is obviously short-term, the youth without any job experience finds out what it is really like in the world of work, and comes to a more realistic self-appraisal, without being made anxious by the threat of being fired, since he goes into the job with the full knowledge that it will be only short term. He need not see the job as a career choice requiring any kind of extensive commitment from himself. And, of course, he earns money which he badly needs. This use of short-term placements may be very effective with the many disadvantaged youths who come to project offices requesting placement immediately, and who perceive the agency's insistence on counseling, training, and basic education before placement as a put-off. From the youth's standpoint, it is important that he and the agency agree that the job does not represent an untimate placement, and that the agency will help him to get a good job when his need for short-term placements is over.

By and large, disadvantaged youths come to employability development agencies in the expectation that they are placement agencies. They come to find jobs, not training or counseling, and they tend to evaluate the agency in terms of the kind of job they were able to get with the agency's help. Almost every project reports that the youths have to be "sold" on the need for counseling, assessment, and training. In effect, these agencies are in the position of disagreeing with the youth's self-assessment of his job readiness. Research is required to test the extent to which such self-assessments are justified. A comparison of the job-tenure statistics of those who accept the agency's diagnosis and treatment with those of the youths who reject the agency by dropping out and getting their own jobs would throw some light on the question of whether or not the agency's assessments are more realistic than the youth's. It is the writer's impression that in at least seven of the projects, placement of program graduates occurs at about the same level as job-finding by program dropouts. A more direct empirical measure comes from the Kansas City JEVS, in which the project sought to place directly those applicants who, on the basis of their self-assessments, asked to skip the work adjustment training. The project report notes that these self-assessments were generally accurate: when these applicants were placed without the agency's work adjustment training, they turned out to be steadier workers than those who took the training. Presumably this means that they kept their jobs longer. The project report does not say whether these were more mature, older, or more experienced youths than those who accepted the agency's program.

The point here is that it might be more appropriate for E and D projects to attempt to place those youths who come to the project specifically for jobs, perhaps in short-term jobs at first, with the clear understanding that better jobs would be sought for them after they've had some experience, rather than trying to sell the youths on a counseling and training program for which they do not feel a need. Once placed, those who feel the need for training and counseling are then likely to enter into such programs with more enthusiasm and less suspicion, and more confidence that the agency is able to find jobs for them.

Training in Taking Tests for Employment

A major innovation introduced by several of the E and D projects to the field of vocational guidance and counseling is the training which they provided in taking and passing employment tests. These projects started from the assumption that employment-selection tests are a major barrier to youth employment and, if they could not convince employers to relinquish such barriers, they should prepare youths to surmount them.[7]

Inasmuch as disadvantaged youths tend to have fairly restricted experience in taking employment tests, the projects reasoned that the youths' lack of experience leaves them without test-taking skills. Several agencies administered selection tests to their trainees in order to provide them with relevant test-taking experience in a non-threatening atmosphere. Some agencies did specific training in test-taking skills beyond simple practice and others went even further in preparing youths to take employment tests by bringing the youths to the test site a day or so in advance of testing to give them a familiarity with the place where the testing was to take place (Neighborhood House), or accompanying the youths, in small groups, to the actual testing session to reduce failure anxiety and stimulate mutually supportive camaraderie (Detroit).

Among the projects giving tutoring and practice in taking employment tests were Neighborhood House, Detroit, Hunter's Point, Skills Center, YMCA, and YOB II. In most of these programs, the tutoring was done in small groups or individually by aides or by counselors. The Detroit, YOB II, and Neighborhood House projects concentrated heavily on civil service tests. In some projects, the test training was a part of pre-vocational training (Hunter's Point), in some it was part of basic education (YOB II), and in others it was on an as-needed basis (Neighborhood House).

Neighborhood House reports that it found it rather difficult to make the youths interested in taking employment tests; the boys seemed entirely unmotivated. When a few boys took tests, however, passed them, and got jobs as a result, the others became highly interested. This is just one example of a phenomenon which has been mentioned before: disadvantaged youths often look and act unmotivated to work in the absence of the opportunity to work and the absence of the incentives which work entails. When opportunities present themselves, the classical diagnosis of "unmotivated youth" often turns out to be wrong.

---

[7] This is an excellent example of the logic of trying to change the youths instead of the system; the youths thus bear the double burden of being disadvantaged and held responsible for making the changes which the system cannot, or will not, make in itself.

Neighborhood House then found that once interest was aroused, tutoring in test-taking must start at once. This is consistent with other evidence which indicates that disadvantaged youths do not sustain motivation in the abstract over long periods of time; rather, their motivation seems to be specific to the circumstances and opportunities. This is also the reason for the stress on rapid intake into project programs once a youth has expressed interest. Thus Neighborhood House found greatest enthusiasm for test tutoring when an examination date was approaching. These youths were not likely to take test tutoring just because it might come in handy some day in the vague future.

In its tutoring program, Neighborhood House placed stress on how to take speed tests, on the assumption that disadvantaged youths have a particularly poor time sense. They also found it necessary to train for specific tests; their report notes that the youths did not readily transfer knowledge from one context to another, so that an arithmetic operation which might have been mastered in a basic education class would be failed when it appeared in a slightly different form on an employment test.

In general, then, the Neighborhood House experience suggests that test training must be specific, ad hoc, and immediately relevant, rather than an abstract set of principles and generalizations about tests as a whole. Nevertheless, the test-training program of Neighborhood House appears to have been very effective as a basic education device. Certainly it seems to have met with more enthusiasm in the youths than most projects report for their basic education programs and, unlike the usual basic education program, the interest value and content of test training was excellent because it was so relevant to getting a job.

The Detroit program also included a specific test-training project which sought to prepare youths for an approaching employment test, and to train them specifically in the basic education components which were to be found in the test. They trained boys for four months in the arithmetic required to pass a selection test used by a Detroit steel company. As indicated earlier, this program was highly successful. Although initial performance on the test was well below the norm for high-school graduates, 80 percent of those who took the test after training passed it and were employed.

The Detroit program was considerably less successful in training youths for civil service tests, however. Although many passed the tests, the requirement that civil service selection be from the top of the register means that even though the disadvantaged boys passed the test, the many non-disadvantaged people with higher scores were selected to fill the available slots. Less than 2 percent of the Detroit project's youths actually obtained civil service jobs. The civil service system is one of the most rigid and effective barriers to the employment of the disadvantaged, both within government employment and, by its example to industry, outside it. The full weight of the Department of Labor would be required, at the highest policy level, to produce even a reasonable modification of this system in the public interest.

68/69

II
Counseling

There is no satisfactory definition of counseling. It is an activity which, in some of its forms, is readily discriminable; however, it may appear in guises that make it difficult to isolate from activities such as teaching, training, recruitment, recreation, placement, cultural enrichment, etc. A variety of activities may have counseling value. For example, a program in Negro history may have as its main effect an increase in self-understanding and pride. Or it may make the counseling done by the sponsoring agency more acceptable to its Negro clients. Similarly, a carefully graded series of training tasks may not only result in increased job skill, but also increased self-confidence growing out of successful experience. The YMCA E and D project used its recreational and cultural-enrichment field trips to museums and other places of interest in New York as a way of giving youths practice and confidence in using the city's transportation system, thus helping to break down the extreme orientation to the slum neighborhood which marks many inner-city disadvantaged youths. Such a device is likely to be at least as effective as counseling which explores the client's feelings about taking the subway. To fail to include such a program element in a report on counseling would thus mean missing some of the most interesting innovations in affecting the attitudes, motives, and behavior of disadvantaged youths.

Some activities with counseling value are performed by members of several professional groups, and some by people of no professional background. Some activities involve clear and conscious attempts to influence or modify behavior through such subtle means as locating the youth center in a particular geographical relationship to the rest of the community, or through the management of financial or other rewards and incentives. Such structural and programmatic devices may not be thought of as counseling, but the aims are often the same as those of counseling. Given these problems in definition, all those aspects of the E and D programs which functioned or were intended to function as means of producing behavioral change, in any realm of behavior, including decision-making will be included. In order to avoid overlapping completely with the report on training, behavioral change of increased skill per se will be excluded. Even here there will be ambiguities; counseling is often done to increase receptivity to teaching and training, and to the extent that the design and format of the teaching achieves the same goals it is a kind of counseling activity.

No effort will be made to restrict coverage to those activities which are traditionally parts of vocational and rehabilitation counseling, or to exclude those activities which are more closely identified with social work, recreation, and other such professions. This report is concerned with counseling as an activity engaged in by many people with a variety of professional affiliations; it is not concerned with counseling as a particular professional identity.

Finally, those activities and program elements will be reported which were intended to modify behavior, whether or not these activities and elements are usually or ever defined as counseling techniques.

One consequence of the vagueness of definition of counseling is that precise counting operations become impossible. Tests have names and are fairly readily classifiable. Counseling techniques, philosophies, and general orientations are much less readily labeled and classified. In some cases, these had to be inferred from reports which were not explicit. In other cases, the reports describe their activities in vague and abstract terms, or in ways which bear little or no relation to actual practice. A great deal of professional judgment and opinion enters into this report, and there is little likelihood that other reviewers, or the project personnel themselves, would describe, classify, or evaluate in quite the same way.

Some reports implicitly assume counseling to be some kind of unanalyzable whole which stands for itself. For example, a report might indicate that a youth was counseled for an hour each day, and then say no more about it. Little could be done to include details of counseling in such projects, except by informed guesswork.

It would have been possible to limit this report to only those activities in which a counselor, or a person in the role of a counselor, talks to a client or clients, individually or in groups, with the purpose of helping the client decide, plan, implement his decisions, and use resources for achieving his goals, and/or overcome, deal with, or get around problems which impede his progress toward career development. Such a restriction would simplify matters, make this report more coherent, and more readily recognizable as a report on counseling as it is usually practiced. To do so would leave a large gap in the total Operation Retrieval report, in that none of the other reporting areas appears likely to include features of project operation and activity which are important, and in some cases more efficacious, than traditional counseling in contributing to the goals usually associated with counseling. Or, if they do include such features, they are not likely to deal with their implications from the counseling point of view. In the interest of not permitting such features to be lost, they will be included as part of counseling.

Another reason for not restricting this report to activities clearly recognizable as counseling as it is usually practiced is that, if counseling were to be defined by reference to its current practices and techniques, the possibility of identifying innovations would be closed by definition and the field would stagnate.

The first part of this report on counseling will be largely descriptive, covering the varieties of counseling formats encountered in E and D projects, the various kinds of counseling goals and orientations in the projects, the kinds of personnel involved, and their specific practices and techniques. An attempt to assess the contribution of counseling to the E and D program, to understand its role in projects, to interpret some general problems, to identify some of the techniques which the writer considers most promising, and to suggest ways in which such techniques could be adapted will be made.

In some of the categorizations which follow, there are bound to be inaccuracies. Most projects did a little bit of everything, and judgment alone could be used in deciding that a project should fall under one heading rather than another, especially as the emphases in the written reports of the projects do not necessarily match the emphases in actual program operation.

PROGRAM FORMATS

There were a continuum of programs running from exclusive reliance on individual counseling, through various weights of mixed individual and groupwork in the middle of the continuum, to exclusive reliance on group counseling at the other end. Most programs were somewhere between the extremes, and some of the large multifaceted projects have features which place them at several different points.

Primarily Individual Counseling

Only one program had no group activities at all; it was a program in which only two youths were accepted at a time and fitted into an ongoing sheltered workshop (Kansas City JEVS). Obviously there can be no real group therapy with only two counselees. There were, however, several programs in which all of the formal counseling was done individually. In these programs, the youths were in various groups, such as work-crews, pre-vocational instruction, and trade training, and, although these projects did not always define counseling functions for such groups, it is highly likely that counseling did take place. In some cases, the group leaders, whether teachers, tradesmen, craftsmen, or work supervisors, were particularly selected for their ability to serve as role models to the youths. For example, the skilled craftsmen who conducted the trade training in the Bedford-Stuyvesant YMCA project were indigenous residents of the area who were given special training in teaching methods and techniques. Such selection policies implicitly assume that the group's work involves a kind of social influence that goes beyond the particular skills and knowledge being taught. In fact, the YMCA program stressed the interchangeability of roles between the professional counselors and the skilled craftsmen-instructors, with the counselors even serving as shop assistants to the instructors in order to be on hand in the shop to engage in counseling whenever the occasion arose.

An example may illustrate how well informal counseling by work-crew leaders can work. A work-crew leader (nonprofessional) at CPI noted that the boys in his crew typically had spent all their pay and allowances, received on Friday, by the following Monday. He therefore began the practice of driving his boys downtown in his station wagon immediately after distributing the checks, ostensibly to take the boys to his bank where he could help them get their checks cashed. During the drive he made it a practice to talk in an off-hand fashion about how his own savings were mounting, the amount of interest which was accruing to his account, the desirable things that his savings were enabling him to purchase, etc. As he was paid on a semi-monthly basis, he kept part of each check out so that he would have something to deposit each week, in the presence of his crew. Before long, several boys asked him for help in opening savings accounts in the same bank, asked him to explain what interest was and why banks pay it, and began making weekly deposits of their pay and allowances. Gradually it became the norm for his group, to which new boys conformed as they were added to the group. Such a "dividend" from the work group appears to be a good deal more effective than specific counseling and exhortation about budgeting, although it also makes it difficult to talk with any accuracy about projects which were primarily devoted to individual counseling when they also included such work crews.

Projects approximating the format of primarily individual counseling included ABCD, Draper, and PEPSY.

Other projects, such as Hunter's Point, depended heavily on individual counseling, but also constructed ad hoc groups for special purposes, usually for only one or a very few meetings. In addition to its work crews, Neighborhood House organized ad hoc groups to study the want ads together. One counselor in the same project called his individual counselees together from time to time to talk to them about topics which had come up in his individual counseling often enough to suggest that they might be of general interest. PAL did most of its formal counseling in individual sessions, but youths were free to join special interest groups, such as remedial reading, occupational interest groups, neighborhood friends groups, and/or a leadership group. YOB had groups of youths primarily organized to plan social, recreational, civic, and cultural enrichment events, such as Negro History Week, or a community art show. MFY used group work only when youths were already organized into groups for some other function (e.g., several youths taking

OJT together in the same business enterprise; girls in the teacher-aide training program). Action Housing organized a group program to introduce the training and prepare youths for the MDTA course they were to take, but otherwise relied on individual counseling. CPI also used special purpose groups, such as groups made up of those trainees planning to return to high school. Philadelphia JEVS organized a group of multi-problem trainees who were not responding to individual counseling.

The above programs tended to have at least some scheduled activity of an individual counseling nature for all the youths in the program, either for intake and/or for planning the youth's program in the project, and/or for dealing with personal problems. Thus every youth was seen individually at least once, while group participation for the youth depended to some extent on chance, individual interest, and the kind of training in which the youth was placed.

Balanced Programs

Moving toward the center of the continuum, there were programs in which group and individual counseling were fairly evenly balanced. In these, all youths were assigned to groups which dealt with common problems, or with issues of general applicability, while individual counseling was reserved for planning the youth's program, dealing with the youth's particular problems, and/or obtaining personal information required for intake. The New Jersey OEO program was intended to be of this type, but problems of transportation, organization, and shortage of counselor time resulted in relatively little individual counseling. NCCY did crisis counseling as part of its intake for each youth, and later organized groups of those who were in the same training programs.

Detroit, MFY, Lane County, YOB, UL-NAACP, Springfield Goodwill, and VAS-Altro approximated a pattern of combined individual and group counseling. In several of these projects, the individual counseling occurred before assignment to training, or in the early days of the training, with group counseling during training for the rest of the training period. Those youths with continuing personal problems continued in individual counseling concurrently with the group program. Such seemed to be the case in Lane County, VAS-Altro, Springfield Goodwill, UL-NAACP, and some parts of MFY. In some cases the intention to realize such format was not achieved because of the shortage of counselor time and inadequate organization of the program. For example, the counselors in one project spent so much time in running errands for last minute arrangements (e. g. , getting donuts and coffee ready, setting up the projector, etc.) that they had less time for individual counseling than they wished. Another program simply abandoned its responsibilities regarding counseling, as defined by its proposal, and, after a brief initial interview by an untrained official, did no counseling. In another project, counselors wanted more time for individual counseling, but the program was largely operated through group counseling and there is little evidence that the youths wanted as much individual counseling as the staff would have liked to offer.

In contrast to the programs in which individual counseling for intake and planning preceded group methods are those programs in which the intake process was done in groups, followed by at least one individual counseling appointment for all, and more for the trainees with further need or desire for individual counseling. This was the pattern used by YOB (before YOB gave up its group intake), by Detroit, and by PAL.

Predominantly Group Counseling

A little further toward the end of the continuum marked by exclusive reliance on groupwork are those programs in which all participating youths were seen in groups, and individual counseling was employed only for those trainees with individual problems, problems which they defined themselves, or problems which the project felt required referral to individual counseling. Of course, these projects also had individual meetings with the youths to make training assignments, or to schedule and/or interpret tests, but these meetings tended to involve minimal counseling, being largely for dealing with procedural matters of program orientation and operation. Projects falling into this group include JOBS (which used a private consulting company for intensive counseling of an individual nature), Pinellas County, NMU, Wise County Skills Center, Draper, YMCA, St. Louis JEVS, and Philadelphia JEVS.

In some of these projects, individual counseling may in fact have been extensive, but done on a drop-in, unscheduled basis (Skills Center, Pinellas County, NMU, and Neighborhood House to some extent). In these, the amount and role of individual counseling was determined almost entirely by the youths who sought counseling. The group counseling was initiated by the project, while the individual counseling was initiated by the youths. In such cases there tended to be relatively little individual counseling; apparently, even severely disadvantaged youths do not request or utilize individual counseling extensively, unless they are formally scheduled to do so (and even then they miss appointments). One project was itself so ill-organized that unless it formally scheduled individual counseling in a fixed schedule, the staff seldom got around to offering it.

An alternative explanation for the relative disuse of individual counseling might be that when there are a limited number of counseling resources, programs tend to give priority to project-initiated and defined needs, which are often seen as being more efficiently handled through group counseling, leaving the scarce, left-over counselor time for client-initiated needs. Project reports tend to support the former explanation, however. They indicate that relatively few trainees drop in for counseling or request individual help. Even those projects which report wanting more time for individual counseling indicate that this wish grows out of a project-defined need to intervene with people the project sees as being able to profit from individual help; no project reported greater youth-initiated demands for individual counseling than the project could satisfy.

At about the same point on the continuum are those projects which rely largely on group activities and programming, but as frames within which a great deal of individual counseling is done on an ad hoc basis, in brief interactions, usually initiated by the counselor. Although placed in an earlier category, it is possible that JOBS belongs here. The group leaders held many informal conversations with individuals in their groups, which they tried to turn to counseling advantage, even in the context of basic education training groups, and other task-oriented activities. Similarly, the YMCA program was one in which the counselor was present in the workshop and intervened at particular points to deal with specific problems which manifested themselves during workshop activities. To some extent this was also done by the work supervisors and foremen in all the sheltered workshops and work crews, such as Skills Center, Philadelphia JEVS, by social workers at VAS-Altro, and by the Work Education Coordinators in the Detroit program. Such brief, focused intervention at the moment when a problem arises, and in the setting in which it occurs, will be referred to here as *in situ* counseling. This is potentially one of the most effective techniques for disadvantaged youths, although this effectiveness is highly dependent on the quality of the work experience and training in which the *in situ* counseling occurs. *In situ* counseling can take place in the street; at, before or after job interviews; or at any time when the youth is caught up in the activity about which he is being counseled. The most highly-developed programs for *in situ* counseling were those of Skills Center and YMCA. In some of the other projects, the main counseling was done outside the shop and the interventions were secondary aspects of the work roles of the work supervisors or foremen, sometimes supplemented by referrals to project counselors' offices for formal counseling (e. g., CPI, Phila. JEVS, Springfield Goodwill).

The most extreme positions on the continuum were occupied by programs in which individual counseling was reserved for dealing with problem cases who threatened to disrupt training. In some programs, individual counseling was primarily a disciplinary matter and a prelude to dismissal from the program. Two projects could be identified which reflected this pattern.

No projects were at the extreme of complete dependence on group processes. Although in many projects there may have been some youths who were seen only in groups, no program failed to offer *some* personal or individual contacts at some time during the youth's career in the project, especially during intake, assessment, or placement.

Follow-Up

In all projects in which follow-up counseling was done, it was necessarily on an individual basis. However, this agreement among programs is less impressive when one notes that formal follow-up counseling was in fact, done by only a handful of programs. YMCA, PAL, Springfield Goodwill, St. Louis JEVS, Kansas City JEVS, and Draper seemed to be the ones in which follow-up counseling was considered at least as important as counseling during training and before placement. A few other programs attempted follow-up, either on an informal basis at the discretion of the youth, or from time to time as other activities permitted. Such projects included Neighborhood House, YOB, VAS Altro, and MFY. While some of these projects did formal follow-up on all clients, none of them used the follow-up as a major vehicle for counseling as did those cited earlier.

Two projects also did some of their follow-up work in a group format. YMCA established an alumni club for this purpose, and YOB scheduled evening groups for boys who had been placed on jobs. However, these evening groups were ill-attended (less than 5 percent) and abandoned.

In one project, follow-up counseling tended to turn into group counseling in a fortuitous fashion. One counselor stayed late one or two evenings a week; as boys passed the center on their way home from work and saw his car indicating his presence, they would drop in to chat, constituting themselves as an informal group of shifting membership from week to week (Neighborhood House).

Counseling Schedules

Projects ranged from formal administrative scheduling of almost all counseling in a set pattern, including the number of sessions, through those in which each individual's schedule was established in counseling, to those with no schedule, in which youths could drop in on groups or for individual counseling as they wished. In some cases, groups had a fixed lifetime, in others they continued as long as they seemed to be productive. In some cases both happened, with groups scheduled for a certain lifetime drying up before intended.

Most group counseling was on a scheduled basis, for obvious reasons, with schedules varying from two hours per week to daily meetings. Membership in these groups was expected to continue for the life of the group, which had a planned termination date, or for as long as the youth was in the phase of the program the group was intended to serve (e.g., as long as the youth was in the prevocational phase for prevocational groups, in the intake phase for intake groups, or as long as he was in the work crew with which the group counseling was associated). In the last case, the groups were often continuous, with members being fed into and out of them as dictated by their individual programs and rates of progress. Often such scheduling was also determined by external circumstances such as the availability of a training course and the need to fill it at once.

Individual counseling programs allowed for more variability in scheduling. As noted earlier, some programs such as NMU and Pinellas County were on a drop-in basis, with a counselor almost always available when wanted. In the Pinellas County project the youth was also free to select the counselor he wanted to talk to, or to go to different ones at different times.

Kansas City JEVS encouraged its graduates to return once a month for follow-up, and many did, but they did not like to make appointments for it. They preferred to informalize the relationship, and to take a role more the equal of the counselor, by just dropping in for a chat.

In the Hunter's Point project the intake counselor tried to be available wheneven a youth wanted him. But, in other projects, a firm schedule for individual counseling was worked out, the nature of the schedule varied from youth to youth and was arranged individually. Only three projects seemed to have fairly firm policies about the timing and number of sessions. ABCD scheduled one session for each youth, with the possibility of one follow-up when indicated. Further periodic counseling sessions were intended, but this intention was not realized. Springfield Goodwill insisted on a regular weekly schedule for its individual counselees, noting that they could and did learn to hold things until the appointed time. However, as far as can be told from the report, the number of sessions in that program was variable, depending on client needs. CPI discouraged extended counseling, and expected individual counseling to be concluded in three to four sessions. A longer series of sessions was permitted for problem cases. CPI particularly restricted the number of sessions for youths referred to psychotherapy, in order to avoid permitting the youth to defend himself against the referral by converting the counseling relationship into quasi-therapy.

In those projects that used a great deal of in situ counseling as occasions for intervention presented themselves it is meaningless to talk of counseling schedules. In effect, youths were counseled constantly. There were projects, not mentioned in this review, in which it would be difficult to say that there was any kind of counseling program at all, although some of them did employ people in counseling roles to do what they could in the spaces between other program features.

GOALS, ORIENTATIONS, PRINCIPLES, AND POLICIES OF THE COUNSELING PROGRAMS

There are probably as many different goals, orientations, and counseling philosophies as there are descriptions of them in the project reports. Each project seemed to have its own vision of counseling, a vision of ideological commitment which tends to underlie poverty programs in general. This vision seems to have given the statements of principles particularly abstract and inspirational forms, making the task of summarizing them quite difficult. The problem is worsened by partisanship and mystiques in the field of counseling, in which technical and procedural decisions become embroiled in emotional and quasi-religious commitments to embattled and proselytizing schools of thought. These operate as conformity pressures leading writers to engage in ritualistic exercises attempting to demonstrate and convince the reader of their allegiance to a school by a repetition of the school's catch phrases and slogans. Unfortunately, in many cases these statements only serve as demonstrations of allegiance rather than as descriptions of program elements. There are seldom any logical or meaningful connections between statements of principle and the actual practices of counseling. In these cases, it has been necessary to make inferences regarding the actual though unstated guiding notions of the counseling program. Thus, some projects, convinced of their allegiance to a particular view of counseling, or overly accustomed to using certain ritualistic expressions about counseling, are themselves unaware of the gap between their verbalization and practice. For example, one well-known project built its program on a sociological theory of disadvantage and then described the goal of the program as personality change.

In other cases the verbalizations are so abstract and banal (e.g., "The counselor communicates his respect for the youth as an individual." "We counsel the whole youth.") as to be useless in discriminating among different approaches. Here, too, the job of summarizing requires extensive inference of the realities behind the abstractions.[1]

---

[1] Briefly stated, project report writers wrote a lot of mauldin nonsense.

In the following, an attempt has been made to isloate several general features or principles which were represented in more than one project, to suggest some of the alternative ways in which each of the projects sharing in that principle implemented it, and to contrast those implementations with practices in other projects. Some projects will thus appear under several headings, as a result of their particular combinations of principles, features, or goals. Some of the headings which follow refer to counseling goals, others to techniques which are, of course, ultimately goal-related.

Personality Change

Five projects seemed aimed specifically at producing personality change, which could be inferred either from the projects' descriptions of their intentions or from the manner in which the project reports define and diagnose the problems of their disadvantaged youths. In these projects, joblessness is interpreted, at least proximally, as a manifestation of personality structures unsuited to stable employment, although these personality structures are ultimately ascribed to the conditions under which the youths lived. In these cases, the ascriptions to social causes are little more than lip service, in that the projects did little or nothing directly to affect the communities in which their clients lived, and none of them included programs for modifying the job opportunity structures in these communities. This is all the more surprising for one project was originally established specifically to serve an urban renewal area, implying a community-focused definition of the problem. In general, there seemed to be a tendency for these projects to define their youths' problems as internal to the youths (i. e., as personality and behavior problems) and therefore to be unlikely to feel any compelling need to direct their efforts to community problems or opportunity structures, beyond perhaps expressing sympathy.

One important corollary of trying to change personality is a devaluation of employment as a specific goal of the project. In some cases, this devaluation served as a convenient rationalization for poor placement records; placements can be counted, but the goal of reorganizing personality, or improving self concepts cannot be measured, and thus relieves the projects of the burden of proving their worth through results, rather than through the elaborateness or daring of the procedures employed.

Given such a stance, it is a further corollary that such projects did not make a major effort at job development and placement in jobs which could function as incentives. When joblessness is defined as having an internal cause, external incentives tend to be given little weight. This attitude resulted in these projects trying to find jobs for their trainees, but without much attention to the quality of the jobs. This pattern further contributed to pressures within the projects to discount placement as a criterion. When the projects devoted few resources to job development, and paid little attention to the quality of the jobs, youths were more likely to reject the jobs to which they were referred (or to arrange not to be hired). Thus project dropouts were able to get as good and as many jobs as project graduates, and no objective efforts in upgrading employability could be demonstrated by the projects. In short, projects emphasizing personality change tended to be markedly weak in placements and in any other empirical evidences of efficacy, and this weakness contributed to poor placement results and to a further need to emphasize personality change rather than employment.

As an almost inveitable consequence of these dynamics, such projects tended to place particular emphasis on their techniques, and to rest their claims for efficacy on arguments about the virtues of their methods or their daring. Turned inward, they seemed to develop a strong commitment to a particular kind of tactic. And, of course, without the empirical evidence of placements (and with the absence of research in general which marked E and D projects), these projects were never faced with anything that might throw their techniques into doubt. Thus they rule out self-criticism, while the project's procedures become sanctified. Such a development was apparent in one project's commitment to its format of subprofessional group leadership; in the preciosity with which another protected and isolated its counseling from external influences by the community, MDTA instructors, and the expressed wishes of the youths they served; in the self-conscious attempt of one half of a dual-agency project to convince the other of the efficacy of social casework methods; and in the obeisance to psychiatric diagnoses in the early stages of another's program, a commitment so strong that when the procedures were changed, the staff identified with the personality change stance resigned, being unable to try other methods. Thus a commitment to personality change as a goal tended to interfere with the experimentation function of E and D projects.

A further consequence of this approach was exacerbated internal staff conflict between those responsible for counseling and those responsible for job development and placement. Where the counseling staff tend to idenfity with the clients' emotional needs and to give these first priority over skill training, the staff, who relate to employers, puts greater emphasis on the employer need for employees of demonstrated capacity. The result is disagreement over the placement of particular clients, and general charges by the job development-placement people that the counselors are unrealistic and soft-hearted, and counter-charges that the job developers and placers are hard-hearted, rigid, and tools of the capitalists. Such conflict was particularly marked in personality change oriented programs; it was also found, however, in projects which did not emphasize personality change.

It should be noted that in none of the five projects aiming at personality change was there specification of the aspect of personality that was to be changed, or the direction of the change. That is, they tended to be global and diffuse in their theorizing, making the isolation of measurable behavioral changes impossible.

An emphasis on personality change also means relatively long and expensive treatment using highly paid professionals. YOB noted that those counselors who were therapy oriented kept youths in counseling longer than those with more limited goals. Neighborhood House found that counseling for personal problems was the most time consuming conseling activity. This area was the least valued by the youths, and the one against which they tended to be most resistant.

Two of the personality-change projects deviated from the above description in important ways. In these projects, there was a good deal of confusion over the counseling orientation, with some parts of the reports describing a personality change goal and justifying their procedures with reference to such a goal, and other parts describing rather different goals. One also stressed providing information and experiences about the middle-class world of work in order to change work-related behavior which the project regarded as functional in lower-class settings but dysfunctional for job-holding. This is implicitly a sociological diagnosis but the project does not seem to realize this inconsistency.

The other project which deviated from the personality change goal did so by emphasizing short-term definable goals for its clients, and by casting these goals into vocationally relevant forms. Helping the youths to discover that they can do three things at once--get a job for ready money, formulate long-term goals, and take training to move them toward this goal. The gap between this statement of goals and the psychoanalytic diagnosis of disadvantage in the report may be the result of having sections of the report written by different staff members.

Two other projects may also be mentioned as emphasizing personality disabilities in their diagnosis of disadvantage. However, in both of them, the programs bore no relation to such diagnoses. Neither program seemed aimed at personality change, both being quite specifically concentrated on work skills and work-role enactment.

Interventionism

All the projects, except those which very narrowly defined the limits of their counseling roles, were interventionist in practice, if not in philosophy. That is, they directly assisted, supported, or stood for their clients in the clients' dealings with their social and institutional environments. Project personnel argued for their clients in law courts, intervened with the police, with housing and welfare authorities, intervened in the clients' families, negotiated with creditors, employers, and school officials--even with draft boards. By and large they were advocates of the youths' interests, though few so militantly as MFY.

The most markedly interventionist agencies were Neighborhood House, PAL, VAS-Altro, Detroit, YMCA, Des Moines, MFY, New Jersey OEO, ABCD, JOBS, KEY, Hunter's Point, and Temple. In come of these programs, interventions were not planned as a regular part of agency policy. Rather, the interventions were responses by sympathetic and deeply committed counselors to the imperious needs of their clients. Few of the E and D agencies were organized to facilitate such interventions, which contributed to the hectic pace and atmosphere of such agencies.

Direct interventions are a fairly standard part of social casework practice, and those agencies, staffed by social workers, seemed to take their interventionist activities in stride. However, in professional counseling such activities are new and represent a breakthrough in practice, replacing the more typical non-involvement, passivity, and avoidance of responsibility.

This dramatic shift toward interventionism probably reflects the feeling of counseling personnel in E and D projects that the usual assumption that clients' environments are basically manageable by the clients once they have resolved their inner conflicts or uncertainties is not valid for disadvantaged youths. Interventionism suggests a recognition that even in the best of mental health, disadvantaged youths, alone and unsupported, are not able to control the array of impersonal and hostile forces operating in their environments which interfere with free decision-making. Without the E and D program few counselors would have been exposed to the conditions which lead to such recognition.

The novelty of the interventionism among counselors is probably responsible for some degree of ineptness and confusion in managing the interventions. Untrained in juvenile law, unfamiliar with welfare principles and the welfare bureaucracy, unused to making home visits, many project personnel had to learn through trial and error the opportunities, strategies, and techniques they might use and the alternative courses of action available to them. There seemed a tendency to accept narrower limits than are necessary; counselors, unaware of their clients' legal rights under welfare legislation, for example, accepted the negative decisions of welfare authorities without challenging them in cases where such decisions appear to have been unjustified by law. No doubt extended experience will help to correct this problem.

Some projects indicate that they found it difficult to justify their interventions within the existing counseling theory of self-determination and avoidance of client dependence, and there were frequent soul-searchings about the extent to which the agency has a responsibility to society versus the client, when the two appear to be in opposition. Others resolved the question to their satisfaction by arguing that the role of client's advocate is necessary as a demonstration of the agency's and counselor's commitment to the client who would otherwise apply his mistrust of middle-class "helpers" and bureaucratic institutions to them.

Most of the areas of intervention mentioned in project reports were such that it is difficult to describe any particular form of intervention; they depended on the character of the crisis and the needs of the client at the moment. However, there are two areas of intervention which admit of a number of different formats: intervention with parents, and intervention with prospective employers.

Intervention with Parents

Many projects made it a regular practice to visit with and counsel parents in their homes. Action Housing counselors visited the homes of prospective trainees to acquaint them with the program, tell them what to expect, and develop a realistic base for family support. The Draper follow-up counselor visited the families of his boys before they were released to their hometowns in order to prepare them to help in the parolee's adjustment. Counselors in the Draper project also wrote letters to the youths' families when the boys entered the program to solicit support and suggestions from them. The intake counselor at Neighborhood House found that the youths liked it very much when he visited their homes to meet and talk with their parents. VAS-Altro stressed the importance of early contact with trainee's families, but did not make it clear whether it was arranged through home or office visits. Wise County counselors also visited parents and youths in their homes, even in remote rural sections, but such counseling was not a standard practice for all. They tended to occur mostly when a youth was in trouble with the program, typically for lateness, non-attendance, poor dress, etc.

There were, of couse, many other projects in which home visits were made as the occasion arose, but not on a regularly scheduled basis for all project youths.

The other most usual format for intervening in the family was to invite parents to the projects for interviews. The three JEVS projects did this, asking parents to come in at some time during intake. These projects stressed making specific and concrete suggestions about ways in which parents could help their children: making sure that there was an alarm clock and that the youth got up in time; making sure that he had carfare and pocket money for lunch; letting him finish his training instead of pressuring him into taking the first job that came along. These projects felt that these specific suggestions to the parents did much to enable the parents to help. Philadelphia JEVS also noted that when the families visited the workshop, they tended to be quite impressed with the activity and the training that they saw going on, and that this helped to motivate them to cooperate. They also note that the youths were markedly pleased by the parents' interest in their training. Kansas City JEVS also called parents after their youngsters were placed in a job to make sure that the parents were continuing to help in the same ways.

Three projects attempted to develop formal group activities for parents or wives. In general, these group counseling attempts did not succeed. In one, few mothers responded. At another, parents were either uninterested or could not arrange to attend the meetings, or expected so much from the counselor that they were disappointed and dropped out. However, it must be noted that there is some reason for thinking that the counselor in that program was not particularly skilled in group management and counseling.

One of the two wives groups at Action Housing was considered a success. The groups were formed as a result of finding that the husbands' training was producing a strain in their marriages. The wives were suspicious that their husbands were really seeing other women instead of attending class, they resented not having the husband around to help with household chores, or they had no belief in the efficacy of training and wanted their husbands to take immediate jobs. On their side, the husbands found if difficult to study in noisy households and feared that their wives were going to hold them back from the high-class careers they envisioned for themselves. Thus Action Housing tried to organize wives groups.

The successful group was the one which had been introduced by home visits from the volunteer woman recruiter, who explained to the wives the purpose of the meeting, what would be talked about, and who else would be there. The project felt that this personal contact and reassurance that the wife "belonged" with the others in the group was the factor in making the group successful. Very few wives showed up at the other group which had been announced by mail and attendance rapidly fell off.

Action Housing found that the most popular topics for the groups were those concerned with housewifery--shopping, recipes, housecleaning aids, etc. However, it should be pointed out that such a program is rather far from dealing with the kinds of issues and problems that the groups were initially intended to deal with.

Neighborhood House felt that wives and girl friends constitute a most significant support for the boys in the program, and wanted to mobilize such support through a program for wives and girl friends. However, OMAT funds for this purpose were denied.

Accompanying Youths to Job Interviews

One of the important practices which became current in interventionist E and D projects was that of accompanying youths to their job interviews. This was done to help reduce anxiety, as a supportive measure, and to help the youths overcome their characteristic avoidance of leaving their home area. It was also done by some projects as a means of sponsoring a youth to an employer, and increasing the probability of his getting a job.

Nine projects report having made a practice of accompanying youths to job interviews: Pinellas County, New Jersey OEO, MFY, Kansas City JEVS, St. Louis JEVS, YOB I and II, Davis Goodwill, and Neighborhood House. In no case was it done with all youths; such a procedure was reserved for those who needed it, either because they were too anxious to go alone, because the project wanted to be in a position to soften the blow if the youth were turned down, or because the youth was so different from the stereotype expected by the prospective employer that it was felt necessary for the project to represent him and help sell him to the employer. Kansas City JEVS reports that it accompanied about 25 percent of the youths--especially the short, puny boys who did not look strong enough to employers, the very shy and timid, and the very black Negroes who usually find themselves the objects of strongest prejudice. Kansas City JEVS is frank with prospective employers about juvenile delinquency records, but also reports that it does not do to stress such records. Employers want to know about delinquency records, but do not want to be continually or forcefully reminded of them.

Neighborhood House reports that many boys do not want to be accompanied to jobs, and one sheltered workshop abandoned its use of the practice with the claim that it led to too much dependency. The project felt that some youths were hired who might not have been, but that such youths very frequently lost their jobs shortly thereafter or quit. Often this was because the youth could not get to work on time, had to rely on uncertain transportation, or because the job was further from home than he liked, factors which the youth would have discovered had he gone on his own to the interview, but are unlikely to be discovered when an official drives him from the project offices to the interview.

It is hard to understand why project planners did not think of obvious ways around this problem. The answer is probably that the project was particularly sensitive to encouraging dependency. However, is dependency, if it does materialize, so terrible as to be more important than helping a youth get a job? The data suggest that the accompanied youths are more successful in getting jobs than the unaccompanied. YOB reports that 85 percent of those it accompanied were placed, and Davis Goodwill found the greatest placement success among those accompanied by the placement director. Further empirical data are required to discover whether accompanied youths have shorter job tenure than those who got their jobs on their own, whether or not this is offset by greater placement success in terms of numbers who got jobs.

YOB found that it was fairly successful, when accompanying youths to job interviews, in persuading employers to hire youths with delinquency records when the job developers had enough details of the case to be able to reassure the prospective employer of the minor nature of the delinquency. However, inasmuch as delinquency records have no legal standing in many states, and courts have ruled that records of delinquency do not have to be reported, thought must be given to the question of whether such records should be reported to employers. Such an exploration must deal with the limits of an employer's right to know about personal affairs of employees, and of the possibly counter-productive effect of exposing project-sponsored youths to greater risks of rejection than similar youths who refuse project services.

A good deal of emotional concern has been expressed about accompanying youths to job interviews. It has been variously described as hand-holding, babying, dependency-encouraging, and beyond the proper role of a counselor. An agency's position on the question may depend on the extent to which it considers the forces operating against disadvantaged youths to be basically reasonable and manageable by the youths. That some of the moralizing about the issue may be little more than displaced prejudice is suggested by the observation that in higher echelons--for example, among new PhD's seeking a first professional position, or among top business executives--it is common practice for the candidate to be accompanied by a sponsor to the job interview, or at least to be personally introduced to the potential employer by his sponsor, his senior professor, or another business executive. Such introductions are considered matters of courtesy; they are also frankly seen as smoothing the way for the candidate. Yet one seldom hears such professional and executive job candidates described as dependent, immature, or babied. One of the features of disadvantage is precisely this lack of access to sponsorship, and it is this lack which agencies, especially employment services, should eliminate by serving as the sponsor to those who have none.

One major advantage of the practice is the opportunity it provides for on-the-spot counseling at the point of maximum impact on the youth, when he needs information and support and has no doubt about its timeliness and relevance. YOB describes such a counselor who drove three boys to three different job interviews in one trip. At each one, while still in the car, he used the opportunity to explore with the boys their feelings about the interview, their expectations, and to rehearse them in interview behavior. As indicated earlier, such in situ counseling is considered most appropriate and effective for disadvantaged youths.

It appears that one of the important innovations in E and D counseling is the acceptance of some aspects of social casework method. This will have enduring effects on the counseling profession, although its more immediate consequence is likely to be further confusion over professional identity, and thus some tendency toward even more rigid adherence to established counseling theory.

There is likely to be a polarization between identify-conscious conservatives and interventionist younger activists--a conflict which is already represented in Youth Opportunity Centers and other employment service offices.

Speed of Service and Crisis Orientation

Another major innovation in counseling and other services was the emphasis on speed in several of the programs. In some cases (e.g., YOB, PAL, and PEPSY) program changes were introduced when it seemed clear that dropout rates during the intake phase could be reduced by organizing immediate or near-immediate intake into the project. Philadelphia JEVS and Skills Center explicitly recognized that disadvantaged youths do not tolerate delay readily. Both projects were structured to allow applying youths to begin work and training within 24 hours of application. CPI tried to limit the number of times that it was necessary for a youth to return for intake, testing, and counseling before he began making concrete plans. CPI's report does not present any statistics on dropouts during intake; but they do not seem to have been able to achieve the speed of intake which characterized these other projects. MFY also tried to engage youths in work programs as soon as possible, and to place the youth on a rung of the job ladder as close to actual job placement as they thought he could handle. However, MFY, like CPI, did not achieve the speed of Philadelphia JEVS or the Skills Center.

NCCY was explicitly a crisis-oriented program, drawing heavily on crisis theory of social work. The crisis theory is a belief that a brief intervention, when a youth has just been rejected for military service, may be more effective and efficient than even extended counseling after the youth has developed undesirable defenses and adaptations to the traumatic event NCCY noted that the sooner a youth was referred, the better the chance that he would follow through. Thus an attempt was made to refer him to placement or training during the first 15-minute interview which, in most cases, took place immediately after the youth had been informed of his rejection from military service.

Neighborhood House also noted that the greatest motivation arises out of crisis; that is why the program tried to take youths in immediately and mobilize their self-interests. Neighborhood House believes that help in solving crises, usually cash crises, provides the agency with the opportunity to start vocational planning with the youths.

PAL abandoned its costly and time-consuming clinical intake in favor of a more rapid group intake procedure which permitted individuals to get started in PAL's program promptly and without waiting for repeated and wearying testing and interview appointments. YOB's intensive two-day intake groups were designed to do the same thing. Lane County found that when it switched from individual intake to a faster group format, it cut the drop-out rate during intake from 24 percent to 14 percent.

PAL specifically included within the group intake some instruction on job search techniques, so that the young people in the group would get, at the very beginning, some of the employment service and help that they came for.

Neighborhood House found that any delay between intake and the next phase of the youth's progress through the program increased the dropout rate. Thus the project emphasized speed in getting the youths into some kind of responsible paid work, such as immediately sending him on errands for the project, or hiring him to wash project staff cars, mow lawns, and the like. In this way the project tried to show the youth immediately that it understands his need for money, is able to trust him to carry out assignments, and will do what it can to meet his needs.

In all, there were eight programs which made an explicit point of providing immediate and speedy service: Philadelphia JEVS, CPI, Skills Center, Neighborhood House, PAL, YOB, and NCCY. PAL and YOB achieved this through group intake procedures; CPI by trying to get maximum efficiency from its counselors; and NCCY, JEVS, and Skills Center by a program structure which permitted the immediate feeding in of youths as they applied. However, it should be noted that in the case of NCCY, once counseled, youths sometimes experienced considerable dealy in getting into any kind of training, although the project tried to reduce such delay as much as possible.

Almost the exact opposite position was taken by a large agency in an east coast city, primarily as a way of protecting the agency. As a result of an unfortunate case of a client who desparately needed money and was immediately referred to a job, but then turned out to be an offense to her employer because of drug addiction, drug-pushing, prostitution, and dishonesty, the agency decided that no client could be sent on a job referral until the client had been carefully screened and the social-service register of the city checked. The staff is reported to have agreed that there should not be such an immediate need for cash that could justify an immediate placement (although nothing is said about how the agency was going to arrange this). This was one of the few cases in which an E and D agency felt a stronger responsibility to the business community than to the client, although it was not the only case in which an agency assigned a higher priority to its own needs than to the client's. The agency seems not to have considered the possibility that the girl be counseled regarding her behavior concurrently with a job placement that provided her with money to live on.

Specific Work Relevance Limitation

In contrast are programs which emphasized an interest only in those parts of clients' lives, experience, and problems which affect their employability and vocational development. There were seven such programs: Philadelphia JEVS, Kansas City JEVS, St. Louis JEVS, MFY, YMCA, Skills Center, and Neighborhood House. It might appear that a policy of limitation contradicts an interventionist stance. However, three of these agencies, YMCA, MFY, and Neighborhood House, were also cited as interventionist. The interventions were restricted to those problem areas having direct bearing on a youth's participation in the programs, on his ability to acquire job-required behavior patterns, and/or on his ability to get and keep a job.

Neighborhood House reports that its restriction of focus resulted in increased community support, as it moved from a psychosocial orientation to a strictly vocational one.

Philadelphia JEVS reports that its counselors listened with sympathy and interest to clients who wished to discuss personal problems, though the counselors could not help them with such problems. They also report that their most successful group counseling sessions were those which were specifically job-related. The follow-up research done on JOBS "graduates" supports the conclusion that project youths are more interested in vocational matters than in other adjustment problems. YMCA, like Philadelphia JEVS, was also careful to avoid entering into personal problems that were felt to be beyond the scope of vocational counseling.

Two programs (MFY and the Skills Center) believed that young people can be trained for work, can get jobs and be employed, even with personal problems, and that this work adjustment was the first task to be accomplished. The personal problems could be dealt with later, if the youth's new psychosocial and financial position as a wage-earning employed adult did not resolve them.

It might appear that these projects felt a stably and productively employed neurotic was better off than an unemployed one, and that it was both easier and more necessary to deal with the unemployment. This position contrasts with that of some other projects which seemed to feel that they could not refer a youth to a job opening until the project was comparatively satisfied with the youth's behavior on all counts; and lacking such satisfaction, they could only hope to place these youths in low-level and dead-end jobs.

The projects may have operated as inhibitors of placements, rather than facilitators. Youths saw this situation as one in which they were put through various kinds of counseling and classes to test their patience as a major criterion for being job ready. The youths were required to conform to the projects' standards before the project would offer them placements.

Only a few projects worked things the other way. The Syracuse Skills Center put its boys to work before counseling. PAL and MFY tried to do so, in a few cases, as the work, its setting, and its problems became realities. Syracuse explicitly stated this guiding principle. To place youths in meaningful employment to provide a concrete reality for the counseling to deal with, and as a condition for the youths to recognize their need for training and counseling.

YMCA reports that its best counseling was done on the job, during visits by the counselors to the youths' work sites, and that such impromptu counseling was more effective than office counseling.

UL-NAACP supports this view with the observation that their counseling became much more realistic and effective once the project had work-training placements to which the counselees were assigned.

YMCA noted that the best-liked part of its daily schedule was the work experience in the machine and auto shops, in which the boys took the role of worker in practicing the skills they were learning. Youths liked this part of the program so much that YMCA scheduled it for the end of the day, to give the boys something to look forward to during the more difficult, fatiguing, or less preferred parts of the program (basic education, counseling, classroom instruction). This was one of the few programs which used the youths' interests as incentives and rewards.

Two programs had, as part of their work orientation, a policy of trying to maximize their youths' strengths rather than concentrating on problems and disabilities (CPI, Neighborhood House).

In the very nature of their operations, all the sheltered workshops contained the feature of getting youths into paid work as soon as possible. The subsidized work experience stations of MFY could be considered as sheltered workshops in this respect. The Skills Center was the program most highly organized around this concept, and the work was of a relatively high level, rather than the unspecialized routine operations carried out in most sheltered workshops.

Overall there was a tendency for those programs with an orientation toward employment as an immediate goal to use counseling as support to work, rather than as a preliminary stage, hurdle, or barrier to work.

The use of counseling in support of concurrent work appears to be one of the most productive formats for working with disadvantaged youths, and has a great deal to recommend it.

Limited Goals

Focusing counseling narrowly on job-relevant behavior should not be confused with emphasis by several programs on the use of limited goals as a general program strategy. In four projects (Pinellas County, PAL, CPI, and YOB), counselors encouraged youths to set up short-term, reachable goals related to their interests, and to lay out steps which would readily lead to such goals, thus giving the youths rapid experience in successful planning and problem-solving, and in taking steps which result in fast pay-offs. In effect, then, long-term plans were reduced to a size which the youths can understand and accept, a time scale that the youths can tolerate, and a level of difficulty the youths can see as possible.

Projects seem to have arrived at this strategy through trial and error, notably through the discovery that disadvantaged youths do not think in terms of the distant future, have little confidence in planning for the future, and often think of such planning as unrealistic and silly. What they are primarily interested in is getting a job now. Such youths often go along with a counselor's desire to talk about the long-term future, but without conviction, to please the counselor enough to get them jobs.

Concreteness

One of the great advantages of in situ counseling, and of counseling which is concurrent with work training or actual employment, is that it lends itself readily to concreteness. That is, the counselor and the client can talk about specific behavior in actual and current situations, and attitudes as they represent themselves in behavior. They thus avoid the abstraction, generalization, and academic discussion with which office counseling not directly associated with job performance must deal. This is a great advantage for counseling non-intellectualizing disadvantaged youths who have a limited vocabulary of abstract concepts. Five projects emphasized concreteness as characteristic of their counseling: Kansas City JEVS, Skills Center, YMCA, VAS-Altro, and UL-NAACP. The first four achieved it by stationing their counselors directly in the work-training shops and workrooms, ready to be called on to intervene at any time. Other projects strove for concreteness, but their organizations, in which counselors were not actually present in the work place, or like MFY and Neighborhood House, only periodically visited the work place, did not lend themselves to the immediacy of counselor response which concreteness demands. In those projects in which the counselors were not present at the youths' work sites, counselors tended to have only infrequent and distant communications with the work supervisors, despite their best efforts to the contrary, and this distance further removed the counseling from relevance.

Concreteness is not only a value to the counselee. YMCA points out that the presence of the counselor at the work site makes the counselor much more realistic about what is involved in the work. He can thus avoid wasting time and effort on irrelevancies. He is also in a better position to understand the needs and requirements of the job development and placement staff, and reduce the intra-staff conflict which characterized some projects.

As indicated earlier, in situ counseling need not be restricted to the work place. For example, in St. Louis JEVS and Philadelphia JEVS, suggestions about how to behave in a job interview were given, clothing and appearance were discussed, and filling out an application covered at the point when a job opening had been developed for a youth. Role-playing the interview took place just before the youth was to go for the interview. Obviously such counseling help was more likely to be remembered and attended to when given at that time than when they are part of a formal curriculum presented to boys to whom actual jobs appear as vague and unreal possibilities.

Career Development

Most of the projects saw their work as finished when they were able to place a youth in a job, except for the few that did systematic follow-up checking. As the jobs on which most youths were placed were low-level and dead-end jobs, and seldom last long, this shortsighted view is especially regrettable. It seems likely that such placements will do little more than attenuate the youths' poverty, for few of the jobs are stable enough, pay enough, or lead to anything better enough to be likely to start the youths on the path out of poverty. There were a few projects which did take a longer view. They tended to see the first placements as serving primarily to give the youth a real job experience, and to give him time to perfect his skills. They planned with the youth his entrance into a stable career line, assisted them in getting jobs on a career ladder, and made such promotion placements themselves.

Two projects, YMCA and PAL, had this orientation. YMCA would place boys on a first job and then, in a few months, place them in a better-paying and more highly-skilled position, while counseling them about career development. PAL, in a few cases, helped "former" clients prepare and circulate credentials for career jobs, and offered them other supports.

Kansas City JEVS dealt with long-term career development by placing its trainees only in jobs that had a large potential for further skill training; in cases in which the youth could not handle such jobs, or there were none available in the youth's area of interest and aptitude, the youth was placed in a short-term or dead-end job with the promise that when he had worked at the job for three months or so, the project would find a better job for him.

MFY was a good deal less career oriented but took some steps in this direction by directly placing on jobs those applicants who insisted on immediate placement and refused counseling and training. After placing such a youth, MFY tried to bring him back for evening counseling to help him keep the job and upgrade his career.

Associated with the high priority that some of these projects attached to career development activities was a general tendency to use job placements selectively as treatment resources. That is, the kind and quality of job on which a youth was placed was sometimes specifically selected for its treatment implications. In some cases, projects arranged a series of placements for a particular youth, with each job in the series playing a particular role in the overall plan. For example, YMCA reports the case of a highly talented and skilled trainee who could not accept supervision, advice, or criticism. After he had lost the very good job in a high-class machine shop in which the project had placed him, he was placed in a more run-of-the-mill shop. He lost that job also. The quality of the jobs he got deteriorated until he found himself in a very dirty and unpleasant manual labor job, at which time he began to understand the consequences of his behavior pattern. At this point, he was again placed in a high-class machine shop, and did much better than before. All three career development projects attempted to use placements in this therapeutic manner, although such use was on a limited scale in PAL.

No doubt other projects would have liked to have used placements selectively. Their emphasis on providing services before placement rather than afterward, together with generally inadequate job development, and a real shortage of jobs in their communities, prevented them from doing so. It must also be admitted that two of the career development agencies, YMCA and Kansas City JEVS, had relatively few boys to work with at any one time, and were in good labor market areas.

With career development orientation, it is not surprising that YMCA and Kansas City JEVS were able to report placement figures which were the highest, or among the highest, in the E and D program and that the job tenure of those they placed seemed well above those achieved by nearly all the other projects.

This use of career development resources reinforces a point made in the Introduction, suggesting that program resources (such as placement) can be used to achieve some of the goals of counseling, even though such program resources are not, themselves, a part of counseling.

An emphasis on career development per se is not sufficient, however, as shown by one project. Its boys were given talks and discussions about career planning, and their counseling about their tested aptitudes and interests emphasized careers. But the project had no career, job-training resources, and no career job placements for the youths, making such counseling not only irrelevant but even traumatic.

Several projects tried to use short-term job placements, mostly in manual jobs, as counseling resources, either as a way of meeting some financial pressure in the youth's life while continuing him in the project, as a demonstration of the agency's commitment to the youth, or as a "real life" method of modifying behavior. NCCY used such jobs as a way of helping youths afford training for better jobs. Neighborhood House used short-term or part-time jobs in all three ways, as did PAL. Neighborhood House reports that it tried to "ease" youth into full-time employment and work adjustment by what might be considered the classical psychological procedure of successive approximations: work on a work crew, followed by part-time or short-term employment outside the project, culminating in a regular, permanent placement. The basic idea is that such short-term or temporary placements bridge the gap between training and full-time work, and provide the youth with a relatively safe way of testing himself out in the real world of employment before he invests himself psychologically so deeply in a job that he is too afraid of losing it to feel the freedom to experiment.

Kansas City JEVS also used such short-term placements as practice for a future, better placement, as did St. Louis JEVS and CPI. Neighborhood House adds that the use of short-term placements also has the effect of keeping a youth coming back to the project for new placements, so that the tendency of those placed on jobs to not return for follow-up counseling is counteracted.

All projects using jobs in these ways indicated a need for more such jobs to be available.

It should be noted that these uses of short-term placements in low-level jobs are only likely to work as motivators for youths if it is clear that the agency will make good its promise to upgrade them. If the youths of the project have doubts about the agency's ability to follow through, they will see such placements as being no more than they could get for themselves without going through the agency's testing, counseling, and training procedures.

Persistence

A degree of patience and understanding well beyond that which has characterized most bureaucratic institutions dealing with young people was displayed by almost all the E and D projects. Even they had their limits, however, sometimes by conscious administrative decision, sometimes as by-products of the kinds of priorities on scarce staff time. Most programs found that the press and demands of new applicants and clients anxious to press ahead into job placements pre-empted the time and resources they could devote to those who dropped out, who failed to take best advantage of the training, or who did not respond well to the program and messed up on job placements afterwards. Some projects seemed to experience periodic pangs of concern about these failure cases, and would mount brief campaigns to find them and bring them back into the fold, but usually new pressures from those still in the programs made such campaigns short-lived and the scarcity of jobs in which to place their youths made it difficult for them to risk losing or wasting a placement resource by making it available to a youth who had already failed on placements in the past.

Further, with limited job resources and limited job development staff, projects tended to develop norms regarding the amount of effort they could put into placing a particular youth. Beyond some kind of subjectively experienced "discouragement point," job developers would begin to feel that further effort would be useless, that the youth was unplaceable, and would refer him back for further counseling or training, or would use the "don't call me, I'll call you" gambit. For many youths their "last" chances, as represented to them by the publicity attending E and D projects, thus passed them by.

At the extreme were those projects which used disbarment from the program as a final punishment for misbehavior. Most projects found that they had to suspend or drop some youths for aggressive or antisocial behavior. They used such disbarment as a last resort and with a good deal of ambivalence (except, perhaps, for one school-based project, which expressed some pride in the rigidity with which it clung to irrelevant standards of dress and comportment), recognizing that for many youths, these programs were in fact last chances and that by suspending a youth, they were cutting off one whose behavior indicated that he needed help the most from the "last resort." In such cases it is understandable that projects often decided in favor of devoting their resources to the many pressing for services instead of the few real problem cases who would otherwise take inordinate amounts of time from youths who might make better use of it. Such decisions are understandable; but it must also be understood that this reflects exactly the same ordering of priorities which has existed in traditional social welfare agencies, community guidance clinics, and school systems, resulting in almost a complete lack of services to the disadvantaged by such agencies in the past. There seemed always to be new applicants for services who appeared more likely than the disadvantaged to make best use of the programs. Over the decades, the overall result has been to harden the core of the hard core by leaving this group without any ameliorative social and professional services. Services become more and more concentrated on the middle-class customers, and the problems of the disadvantaged were left to compound themselves. It was precisely this kind of development against which the E and D projects were a reaction.

Certainly the E and D projects, in their relatively brief history, have not gone far along this road; it took the established agencies decades to get to their present state. Like the E and D projects, even the most staid and middle-class service institutions such as settlement houses and family service agencies originally began as ideologically committed efforts to aid the poor and downtrodden by providing services to those who had none. It is thus a dangerous omen for E and D projects to set foot on the same path of ordering priorities, lest they travel the rest of the way by the force of circumstances, and without ever being conscious of it. It was not until the establishment of the poverty program that traditional agencies, long accustomed to thinking of themselves as specifically concerned with the poor, awoke to discover that they had moved very far from their own heritage.

The only defense against such a progression is a rigid adherence to a "never give up" principle, in which no youth once admitted is dropped, permanently excluded, or left to fend for himself after a few failures, even if this is at the cost of not providing services to others knocking at the door. Agencies might do better to leave those knocks unanswered, for in the long run the crowd around the door will stimulate an expansion of staff and increase the number of agencies available to cope with the demand--an expansion which is less likely to occur if existing agencies try to handle all and because of the rush, handle them badly and pass over the hard ones. Such minimal services and programs would hardly support the claims of efficacy which are required to support demands for expanded facilities. Thus, in the long run, program quality is likely to be a better strategy than a quantity bought at the price of leaving the difficult cases for last.

There is a danger in such a strategy of losing community support, if the community begins to see the agency refusing services to too many people, or creating long waiting lists. An agency taking the "never give up" philosophy would do well to remain in close contact with its community, and to maintain activity which reflects its commitment to the community, while it streamlines its program to eliminate the preciosities which masquerade as attempts to provide the most "polished" services to those receiving any services at all. A certain amount of agency guilt about those it is not serving may be a necessary goad to motivate the continual refinement of methods needed to provide as much good service as possible. The length of the waiting list is a good index of agency apathy. It might even be possible to arrange agency funding on a sliding scale, with relatively larger sums per case for those cases with the greatest need--the hardest core--and less money for easier cases. With funds supplied on such a basis, agencies would find it to their advantage to be sure that their caseloads are full of the most difficult cases and the hardest core. Such a basis for funding employment service offices would be quite feasible, with the budget set according to the numbers served at various income and occupational levels. The greater proportion of disadvantaged cases, and other handicapped workers, the greater the funding.

Only a few E and D projects approached closely the "never give up" line: Kansas City JEVS, St. Louis JEVS, and NCCY, each in its own way, adopted this principle consciously. Two other agencies, YMCA and Neighborhood House, acted in ways consistent with the principle, though they did not stress such a guiding notion in their reports. Obviously, in this mix of small and large, specialized and multi-purpose agencies, the principle was implemented in different ways.

Philadelphia JEVS expressed it in a most important place: job placement. They report that they never ceased trying to find a job for a youth, even though this meant making thousands of phone calls in order to locate relatively few placements. They found that most youths did not get jobs on their first referral. The project took the edge off the youth's disappointment by promising to keep trying to develop leads for him. MFY's report notes that it often took placement in a couple of jobs, each of relatively short duration, before a youth learned enough about the world of work to make a go of it.

One sheltered workshop found it necessary to suspend some youths from its program, and it is apparent from its report that staff members found themselves morally outraged by some of the sexual and aggressive acting out of these youths, and by what the staff seemed to feel was a lack of appreciation for the program's efforts. Nevertheless, the program tried to maintain an open door policy, so that any youth could return to the program, no matter how he had "messed up." Whether a certain Pecksniff attitude might not have discouraged enough of the suspended youths from returning to effectively cancel the policy is another question. However, the project did continuously follow up those who had dropped out, or who had lost the jobs on which they had been placed.

NCCY expressed the principle by placing youths in as many programs and jobs as the youth was interested in, regardless of his record in past placements. The report describes one case of a young man for whom the project staff went to extraordinary lengths to take him out of a bad home situation and get him a "live-in" job which also left him free time to take job training, only to have the boy quit the job as not to his liking shortly thereafter. Nevertheless, NCCY continued to work with the youth in seeking other arrangements and jobs that would be more acceptable. (It should be noted, however, that while NCCY displayed a good deal of ingenuity in making referrals and developing referral resources, as an agency which did not contain in-house services it found itself rather limited in its resources and, under certain circumstances, a "never give up" philosophy cannot go far to compensate for the lack.)

Neighborhood House implemented the principle through its close identification with its community, which seemed to define all the youth in the community as its clients, regardless of whether they had ever been in any of the project's programs. Each new program or opportunity that developed was offered to all in the community without regard to the quality or amount of past participation in Neighborhood House services.

Firmness vs. Permissiveness

Three projects report using firmness as a general characteristic of their counseling. In all three cases, the first impulse was to nondirective and permissive counseling, but the projects' experience indicated that disadvantaged youths tend to perceive such permissiveness as weakness, a trait which is highly disvalued by such youngsters. Thus Pinellas County, YOB, and Springfield Goodwill moved toward a greater degree of firmness in their approach to youth. YOB noted that its counselors try to be permissive and nondirective in the intake or "seduction" phase, but that once they get a boy in the program they find it necessary to apply all the firmness, cajolery, and pressure that the youth will tolerate to move him from his drifting and aimless passivity into planning and action-taking.

In this connection it is appropriate to note observations by Action Housing and Philadelphia JEVS that youths liked best the firmest instructor in the former, the firmest foreman in the latter. Both projects noted independently that these best-liked figures were both firm and fair; understanding and accepting, if unyielding on certain points; and that the youths liked knowing exactly where they stood with these men. Springfield Goodwill found exactly the same thing.

In contrast, two other projects emphasized permissiveness in their policies, one attempting to counter poor response to its permissiveness by designing a more enticing program. The other doing little more than hoping that permissiveness _per se_ would eventually result in trainees learning to appreciate the consequences of their actions. Philadelphia JEVS could not be described as a completely permissive program. It did allow youths to come and go as they pleased in remedial education, however. It reports that its permissive stance on this issue was effective in impressing youths with the nonschool nature of the program, and with the project's willingness to rely on the youths' needs and interests. The project was pleased with the amount of participation the remedial program received, although it does not give any supporting data. The Skills Center reports that under conditions of absolute freedom to choose (and in the workshop with its implicit demands for competence) 30 out of 33 youths requested some kind of academic training.

Feelings about permissiveness _vs._ firmness tend to run high among counseling and social work personnel, and a good deal of piety is invoked on both sides, probably reflecting the inappropriateness of the general concept. It would seem more reasonable to cease using the terms as general descriptions of programs and practices, and instead talk about what is permitted and what is not, and the sanctions available. One project reports that its youths expected unending toleration of acting out from the counselors, and threatened to drop out if not tolerated. The staff seemed to be sufficiently afraid that if a youth dropped out the project would never retrieve him, to make this a potent threat to a program anxious to show that it was successful in "holding" youths, as success in terms of job placement was almost ruled out by the poor labor market and the project's poor job development program.

It is possible for counselors to set limits in a planned and consistent fashion, and to communicate these limits to their clients, within which they may be permissive. In this way, the pain and turmoil of the limits-testing, to which clients are forced by the vagueness and strangeness of what is represented to them as a completely permissive policy (but which does not turn out to be in agencies which refuse to place their youths until the counselors are convinced they are "job ready"), can be more readily and consistently handled and reduced. Without such explicit recognition of the role and place of permissiveness and firmness, counselors find limits-testing frightening and extremely difficult to handle, risking over-response by becoming defensively strict and firm when it is inappropriate.

The difficulty in setting appropriate limits is compounded by a behavior pattern noted in two of the project reports (NMU and Pinellas County), and probably present in others. It was noted that at the beginning of participation in the projects, the youths were on their best behavior. They seemed to accept the mystique and spirit of the program, and were anxious for acceptance and approval. Under such circumstances, the projects had little need to set limits explicitly, or even to face the issue. But as the youths became more familiar with the atmosphere, more confident, and perhaps also more disappointed and annoyed with the unexpected slowness in the movement toward jobs; clique formation, acting out, and delinquency began to increase. The ambiguity of the counselor's nondirective stance is also difficult for disadvantaged youths to understand. They like to know "where they stand" and engage in limits-testing to find out; they usually do not believe that the situations in which they find themselves are as permissive as they appear. So they test, and find that, in fact, there are limits to the apparent permissiveness, thus confirming their suspicious distrust of the staff's assertions.

It became gradually necessary to institute limits, and projects' responses to this need were sluggish and too late to avoid making the limits appear new and arbitrary impositions or exercises of authority. At such a juncture, many youths are no longer able to trust the project.

For these reasons, it would be well for projects to give serious attention to setting limits in advance, and to communicating these limits before they are breached. Setting limits implies a consideration of the sanctions to be used for violations. Most projects found occasion to use suspension or dismissal from the program as their only available sanction (except for docking pay for lateness), and that step was so drastic that the projects were reluctant to use it and, therefore, without any effective graded sanctions. Where suspension or disbarment is used as a sanction, it is thus very important to keep the door open for the return of the dismissed youth, to invite his return, to make him feel that his return is desired.

Pinellas County went further: it made arrangements with local police for sentences imposed on project youths for minor crimes to be designed not to interfere with the youths' participation in the program, much as some universities make arrangements for their transgressing students to be required to stay in jail only during the evenings or on weekends.

In addition to the above-mentioned projects, three others made selective use of permissiveness-firmness as a program device. YMCA, Springfield Goodwill, and Philadelphia JEVS started youths under permissive supervision and gradually escalated the firmness of their standards (and the difficulty of the work) through the course of each youth's progress. In YMCA the escalation was by the same instructor-foreman; in JEVS it was managed by moving the youths from the most permissive foreman through a graded series of foremen until he arrived at the last, who was the most exacting of all. A refinement might be made in this process, which could be readily subjected to empirical test, by ending the series with a permissive foreman (or instructor) in order to give the youths the opportunity to internalize these standards and practice in relying on them without outside pressure.

Client Participation and Responsibility for Programs

Several E and D projects were structured to involve youths directly in the operation of the programs, to take a significant amount of responsibility for themselves and other trainees, and/or to share activities which would otherwise be handled by project staff. For example, Kansas City JEVS requires youths to bring a newspaper every day, and the first hour is spent with the counselor reading the want ads and discussing what they find there. When placement is started, the counselor telephones about job openings with the youth present in the office and participating as a third party in the job development discussion. The counselor also makes it a point to describe the youth to the prospective employer as he is, in the youth's presence. This is done so that the youth knows that if he gets the job, it is on a basis of acceptance of him as he is, and he is not under the strain of waiting to be "found out."

The Skills Center, Pinellas County, and YMCA included trainees through various forms of student governments or councils. In the Skills Center, trainees elected their own group leaders; the groups functioned not only as counseling groups, but as quasi-legislative bodies in the sense that the Skills Center tried to be responsive to the policy recommendations which such groups made. Pinellas County and YMCA had representative student governments which constructed constitutions and rules of conduct and sat in judgment on their peers for violations. Both projects reported that trainees were more responsive to discipline from their peers than they were to staff regulations, and had more respect for peer judgments.

The indigenous nonprofessionally-led groups which formed the frame for JOBS activities probably also functioned to initiate or discuss and advise on project policies and services, although they did not have an explicit or formalized role as legislative bodies.

Lane County and YOB I involved trainees in special purpose groups to arrange program elements, such as field trips, recreational events, and community-wide programs of a cultural enrichment nature.

In the Draper project, so much research was done in the development and testing of programmed instructional materials for skill training that the youths caught the experimental atmosphere and saw themselves as important parts of the process whose responses and evaluations were significant. The boys began to think of themselves as allies of the experimenters, and used their ideas as bases for recommending changes in the experiments and hypotheses. The project thus promoted self-importance and self-observation. Trainees' awareness that the results of the program had significance for programs in other states added to their feeling of self-importance and participation in something of great value.

In some projects, counseling groups conducted their own programs. In one, for example, a group decided to call in various employers to talk to them, while another group in the same project decided to invite parents to participate in the meetings. At Neighborhood House, prevocational groups reviewed their curriculum beforehand, and their suggestions for changes were accepted.

Neighborhood House assigned boys to work-training teams (which the boys saw simply as work) in which each job to be done by the team was preceded by a fifteen-minute group conference for planning the work. Neighborhood House found attendance in the work teams excellent.

Neighborhood House also placed many of its youths in a private, agency-owned company (Supreme Services), which also provided janitorial services as a competitive business enterprise, as a framework for providing boys with work-training experience. Work-crew members in Supreme Services participated in planning the work to be done on their contracts, and in making policy decisions (e.g., whether to spread out the work over several days part-time, or to do a job in its entirety in one sustained effort; whether to use a large crew, with easier work but lowered individual shares in the fees under a profit-sharing plan, or fewer workers taking longer to do the job; how to handle a false workman's compensation claim; how to handle a theft by one of the workers).

It should be noted that such trainee participation did not prevent Supreme Services from being a success as a commercial enterprise; in fact, the company was able to donate money to the Neighborhood House program. A most heartening finding was that under a fee-splitting arrangement, in which the members of a work crew devided the fees received among themselves (except for that portion required for overhead and materials, etc.), boys averaged $2.30 an hour for work which usually averages at little over $1.00 per hour. This testifies to the work and effort the boys were willing to give when the rewards for such effort in direct income terms were assured, thus supporting the hypothesis that disadvantaged youths are responsive to incentive conditions, and that the ascribed motivational deficit in such youths is more likely to be a case of lack of real work incentive inherent in the jobs available to them.

There is no better way to give disadvantaged youths good work experience and practice in all the aspects of the work role, including goal-setting, planning, impulse control, and the other traits which counselors are otherwise left to try to talk into their clients in the abstract. The cooperative money-making work group is not only the best kind of training, most focused, specific, concrete, and real, but it is the kind of structure which goes most directly to the heart of the problem as perceived by youths--need for a job and income--and it does so paying its own way, or requiring relatively small subsidies, compared to the costs of pay and allowances and staff salaries for other kinds of counseling and training programs which do not produce any commercially salable products or services to defray their own costs. The potential of this format for achieving many of the goals of counseling in E and D projects is very great.

Another way in which the youths directly participated in the work of the E and D projects was through arrangements for more able youths in a particular activity to help or coach the less able. PAL and NMU did this. NMU also carried some trainees over to the next training cycle, so that they could take leadership positions among the new trainees. At Draper, youths of differing levels of ability were assigned in work pairs so that the more able could spontaneously help the less able, fostering a feeling of responsibility for others as a means of mutual task fulfillment. The naturalness of this learning situation recommends it. Draper also assigned some responsibilities related to the training (e.g., distributing the tools in the shop).

St. Louis JEVS used the assignment of foremen's duties to youths for the same purposes. YMCA also used brighter boys to help the less able.

Several projects also used youths to help in recruiting (Lane County, Skills Center). While referrals from friends were the most effective sources of intake, relatively few built recruitment into their programs as the Skills Center and Lane County did. Lane County found, incidentally, that the youths who were recruited by their clients were a much more difficult group to deal with, being more anomic, alienated, or "harder core."

The Skills Center developed a friendly competition among youths to bring friends into the program; each youth was given twenty referral cards to distribute, and the youths competed to see who would bring in the largest number.

One project also tried to get youths to recruit, and offered a monetary incentive for each new youth brought in. However, the gimmick backfired: the youths felt that they would be selling their friends, a distinctly disvalued thing.

Lane County's report emphasizes the program's policy of including the youths in responsibility for program operation and policy. Unlike some of the other projects, however, Lane County did most of its implementation through hiring a few youths for subprofessional and other aide functions in the project, as secretaries, clerks, recruiters, receptionists, and group leaders. Many other projects also employed some of their former trainees, often as a means of providing on-the-job training which would later be of use to the trainee, or because the project wanted to take advantage of some particular talent which the youths possessed. Lane County's hirings were intended to have an added feature; they were to demonstrate the agency's commitment to and belief in the youths by being willing to hire them themselves and to provide a means for the youths which the agency had served to participate in the agency's operation. It does not seem likely that such a symbolic representation would be as effective as the more direct involvement of program youths either in making the agency responsive to the needs and expressions of the youths; as a device for providing the youths with practice in planning, decision-making, and acting; or as a demonstration of agency commitment.

One sheltered workshop project represented the opposite extreme. In many respects the project seems to have been paternalistic and condescending, with that puritanical combination of rigid morality and sympathy that marks missionaries among the natives and is summed up in the concept of the "white man's burden." There was little in the project to make its clients feel that they could identify with the agency and the powers that operated it. It is not surprising that the clients stole from the project, did a good deal of physical damage to the property, and engaged in pranks that seriously injured the project's standing in the community.

Client vs Agency Definition of Goals

Except for a few instances, the E and D projects suffered from a common difficulty: a disjunction between the project's view of its goals and the needs of the youths they served. With striking regularity, projects reported that the majority of the youths who came to them came wanting help in getting jobs, and getting a job was their primary motivation. All else--training, testing, counseling--tended to be perceived as barriers or hurdles to placement, or as put-offs. The parts of the programs that youths liked best were placement and actual work experience (YMCA). In one follow-up, the counseling was considered the least important part of the program by the former trainees. Within the counseling, the best liked sessions were those directly concerned with finding, getting, and keeping jobs (JOBS). Draper gave its boys the Mooney Problem Check List and invited them to see the counselor to talk about the problem areas they had checked; only twenty did so.

Eleven different projects reported that what the youths wanted were jobs, and that they tended to see everything that was not placement as irrelevant, nonsensical, or worse (YMCA, YOB, MFY, PEPSY, PAL, Neighborhood House follow-up, CPI, Springfield Goodwill, KEY, and JOY).

The common difficulty experienced by the E and D projects was convincing the youths they needed counseling and training as preliminaries to job placement. Obviously, this problem was worse with the projects that aimed at personality change, a goal as far removed from the youths' goals as could be imagined. The problem was minimal in those agencies which were narrowly job-oriented and concrete, and those in which the projects had mechanisms for being responsive to the clients' wishes.

Some projects were particularly distinguished for their willingness to accept clients' views of themselves and their needs. Lane County emphasized its willingness to become concerned about the things that the youths were concerned about. Neighborhood House found it very important to have some activity immediately available which included an opportunity to earn some money (e. g., sending the youth on an errand for the project). The agency felt that it could gain the loyalty and confidence of the youths through such demonstrations of confidence in them and their needs. Neighborhood House felt that it had to gain loyalty in order to override the youth's reaction to referral for training, which they saw as a put-off or hurdle. The project noted that there is confusion, hostility, and loss of confidence in a youth when he finds himself referred to training rather than a job.

Neighboorhood House also arranged for applicant youths to see the employment service representative attached to the agency right away, in a brief, businesslike contact, to further set the tone of the project as seriously concerned about employment for the youth. The project felt that providing paid work experience shortly after intake was the most important factor in keeping a boy in the program.

PAL provided its clients with opportunities to test their plans, ideas, and self-perceptions even when the staff was sure that they were inappropriate. For example, they would place a youth on a job if the youth was convinced that he could handle it, even if the counselors were sure that he could not. PAL also arranged to give guidance in job-search techniques at the very first group intake meeting, explicitly trying to give the youth at least a part of what the agency knew the youth wanted. Kansas City JEVS accepted client self-perceptions in the sense that those who asked to be excused from work training and instead placed directly in jobs were placed. To the agency's surprise, these youths turned out to have better job tenure records than those who went through the work training program. MFY also tried to place directly those youths who insisted on jobs and rejected training.

Philadelphia JEVS policy of not requiring participation in remedial education letting the youth decide whether and to what extent he would participate, is another example of reliance on the youth's view of his needs.

Other programs implicitly responded to clients' needs and desires for work through their structure. For example, Skills Center was able to put boys to work in the shop almost within twenty-four hours of application. This project also made it a point to label and treat the youths as workers, rather than as students, clients, or other immature-role labels.

These agencies contrast with another group which were distinguished by their refusal to accept as valid the expressed needs of their youths. A west coast project best illustrates this in its institution of a formal orientation program in order to convince youths that it was not primarily a placement agency. Project personnel rejected their image in the community as a placement agency, and began a campaign to change that image. The result of the campaign and the orientation sessions was that youths stopped coming to the program, since the things that the youths wanted from the agency were jobs. The Cleveland JOY project remarks that its greatest difficulty was in convincing its clients to take training rather than an immediate job. Few were the projects willing to risk placing a youth on an immediate job concurrently with his training and/or counseling, although several projects did express the wish that they could have part-time jobs available to be used in this way. It is this which makes the Kansas City JEVS experience particularly significant, for when the agency did take the risk it paid off. Efforts should be made to try to replicate these findings.

Underlying, or associated with, the agencies' position that more than placement is needed seems to be a kind of distaste for placement as such. An emphasis on placement first, with concurrent or post-placement counseling, would essentially require a broadened role for follow-up, changing it from simply a check-up on results to the major vehicle of counseling. But YOB reports that its counselors did not want to do follow-up; they tried to put that duty on the placement people, who also didn't like it and tried to give it back to the counselors. The result was that neither did follow-up in YOB. That experience was probably fairly general among projects.

Both ABCD and Hunter's Point express annoyance that they might be seen by the youths as "nothing more than a placement service." There is a great deal of irony in the observation that agencies presumably established to deal with youth unemployment seem to want to do everything but solve the unemployment, even if this means that they must overcome a good deal of resistence. The final irony is that these same agencies then charge the youths, whose demands for work were turned away, with lack of motivation!

Staff desire to play a more adventuresome and professional role may have played some part in the need to see clients' problems as more than joblessness, as requiring more than placement, and in a rejection of the placement function. This is also reflected in the fact that few projects used counselors to make placements, and most projects left placement as the least developed part of their programs. The general failure to consider the possibility of offering placement and services concurrently may have been a way of keeping the youths available for services they didn't want; the job became the carrot on the stick to be given only after the medicine was swallowed. How much more outrageous that when the chips were down, for so many youths the jobs simply weren't there.

Middle-Class Behavior Norms

Three E and D projects were especially distinctive in the degree their reports reflected a concern about behavior norms bearing only tenuous relation to employability, but closely related to focal middle-class concerns. Thus one report expresses a good deal of concern about the way youths spent their money, their sexual practices, cleanliness, aggressiveness, and diet, and this concern seemed expressed not from the point of view of the health and welfare of the youths, but rather from some kind of moral position. Another project shared some of these concerns, and gave youths lectures on such topics as why they should avoid drugs and addiction. The selection of the topic as a standard part of the curriculum, with its assumption that all disadvantaged youths in their very nature require prophylactic warnings of the danger of addiction may have been gratuitously insulting, for while addiction may be concentrated among lower-class members, the majority of lower-class members are certainly not addicts. While other projects also found occasion to discuss addiction, the presentation in the form of a guided discussion which states its assumption in unquestionable form ("Why should you avoid drug addiction?") provides little basis for a mutual examination of moral and ethical issues by youths and staff.

Probably the most rigid of the programs, in its enforcement of middle-class behavior norms, was in one project which reflected its school board sponsorship. In that program, lateness and absences required a note from home or physician, and trainees were required to wear clothing "appropriate to school" and to comport themselves in the manner usually required at school.

The justification, for requiring disadvantaged youths anxious to work to undergo moral sermonizing and the like as a precondition for getting a job, is questionable. A case can be made that these projects invaded areas not touched in middle-class youths, and which are usually considered to be outside the scope of bureaucratic and public agencies. In this respect, these projects took advantage of the youths which gave their clients no other recourse except to refrain from participating in the programs, which for many was not a possible choice.

One wonders why a youth who comes looking for a job or job training must first be required to sit through a lecture on drug addiction, sexual abstinence, or the virtue of thrift. This is not to say that programs for disadvantaged youths should not be concerned about such matters; rather, these concerns should be handled in a manner consistent with the status of the clients as free agents who are not to be treated as schoolchildren, and with a recognition of the individuals' right to moral and ethical positions not shared by the middle class. May a project decide that a youth who rejects such teaching is not job-ready and is unqualified for placement? Such treatment is an affront and the extent to which E and D projects put the youths into such positions is the extent to which such projects are missing the point of these youths' needs and interests. To the extent that such teaching delays placement of a youth until by his conformity he is considered job-ready, to that extent are the projects operating in a counter-productive manner.

Turning the Problem Back on the Youths

Unemployment, and the traits that go along with it, is an adaptive response to social and economic conditions. In another view, personal traits are seen as the cause or reason for unemployment. The first view implies a strategy of social and economic reform; the second view implies a strategy of changing the individual.

There were occasions, in some of the projects, when clearly structural problems were turned back onto the youths in a manner implying that the problems were personal and behavior problems for which the youths were responsible. For example, failure to provide good job incentives to stimulate striving was generally interpreted in the projects as a problem of low motivation in the youths, to be met by exhortations to get motivated and change attitudes. Inability to develop jobs in a tight job market was an occasion on which projects tended to react by deciding that the youths they were trying to place were not job-ready. Counseling was sometimes used as a delaying action until projects could develop training resources, OJT slots, and the like. Such a counseling function, given explicit recognition in the claims for the success of counseling in "holding" youths until such resources became available,[2] implicitly has the effect of locating the problems in the youths, in place of locating jobs and training resources in the environment. Thus counseling was used as a substitute for providing employment and training opportunities.

---

[2] It is significant to note one report that used counseling as a holding operation, and found that when training placements did become available, the youths had disappeared and it was necessary to recruit anew.

This function of counseling as a way of converting project and social problems into individual problems was expressed in several noteworthy ways. One project reports that it used group counseling to deal with its youths' dissatisfaction with the office-boy training program into which the project had thrown the youths regardless of appropriateness because it had no other training slots or programs available. Thus a problem of the agency was turned into concern about the way disadvantaged youths respond to authority, carry out unpleasant job duties, and the like. Unable to deal with the external problem, the agency asked the youths to change themselves to adapt to it. Thus the agency mirrored the national strategy in dealing with poverty: in the place of changing the systems and situations of poverty, change poor people, implying that they are responsible for all their failures.

Another project reports essentially the same situation in its handling of its youths' dissatisfaction with the work experience stations. The youths felt that they were not learning any salable skills or getting any useful training in the stations, an opinion which the project itself shared. Nevertheless, the project tried to manipulate the youths' feelings about the matter rather than the situation to which they were responding. The project report described this as "smoothing things over."

Several other projects also found that their group counseling sessions were primarily being used as forums for complaints about the programs. In one, the project seemed to feel that providing an opportunity for catharsis was all that was needed, as there is no indication that the project could do anything about the substance of the gripes. Another found its group meetings deteriorating into shouting matches; to counter this, a structured program of topics was introduced. Probably the extreme case was in a midwestern program; when it appeared that the youths were using the meetings to voice their complaints about the MDTA instruction (complaints which experience indicates were probably quite justified), the school simply forbade group counseling.

Cognitive Orientation

Four projects (CPI, NMU, Detroit, and PAL) implied a cognitive orientation in their counseling in their stress on the role of the counselor as one who helps the client formulate questions, explains the available alternatives, and the consequences of various choices, and helps the client to make decisions. The PAL program also tried to provide situations for the client to test his choices; such situations were probably also implicit in the various programs available to the youths in CPI. This kind of counseling obviously requires the counselor to provide information to the client about alternatives and consequences. Detroit, therefore, called such counseling "didactic."

A somewhat different kind of cognitive orientation was that stressed in Kansas City JEVS, Philadelphia JEVS, and the Skills Center. In these projects one of the major functions of counseling was to verbalize, interpret, and make explicit the experiences the youths were having in their training. In a sense, the counseling translated what might otherwise have been an inchoate mass of impressions into cognitive elements which could enter into the youth's self-concept, influence his sense of identity as a competent worker, and increase his self-esteem.

These projects tended to be work-oriented rather than personality-oriented; they also tended to emphasize clients' strengths, so far as employment is concerned, and to deal, in counseling, with barriers to the full utilization of those strengths, rather than with the resolution of problems unrelated to employability.

Strategy of Success

Several projects tried to employ a strategy of success. The term was originated by CPI, which used it to refer to its tactic of getting a good job for a few men in each neighborhood. As the word spread, the project became known as the place where one could get good training and good jobs cathecting the motivation latent in the neighborhood youth.

Related to this strategy was the use of role models of people who had made it up from poverty. For example, some of the Work Education Coordinators in the Detroit program during the intake counseling, told the young people the story of their success in climbing out of poverty. Pinellas County counselors did somewhat the same thing, noting that for many of the youths, the counselors were the first successful men they had ever known. Draper, a prison project, had visits from former prisoners who had made respected names for themselves in the state. Temple also arranged visits from successful Negroes, as did YOF (including successful Mexican-Americans).

YOB and Draper posted photographs of successful trainees around the project, and KEY, MFY, PAL, and Neighborhood House report having former trainees return to visit the project and talk to the youths.

The Skills Center reports that when a member of one of its work groups was moved into placement, it greatly increased the motivation and ambition of the other boys. Neighborhood House found that when some of its boys took and passed a civil service test, others became interested in test preparation courses. JOBS also found that getting one youth in a work unit placed on a job was highly motivating to the others.

Another use of the strategy of success was that employed by Philadelphia JEVS, the Skills Center, and Draper. In all three, the training was arranged so that the youth could start out on a job he was likely to be able to perform sucessfully. This process was most highly developed in Draper's use of programmed instruction. The programs were written to insure a ninety percent success rate, and each item led to a more complex or difficult item.

Programs with Unique Features

Several of the projects were unlike any others in ways that defy classification. For example, the Kansas City JEVS program was organized around an intensive ten-day program in its sheltered workshop, emphasizing rapid movement. The program felt that such intensive and rapid movement was particularly appropriate for disadvantaged youths, who are less capable of long, sustained efforts toward distant goals. YOB I was similar in its use of intensive two-day intake groups.

Two projects (NMU and KEY) were particularly concerned about urbanization, and to motivate the youths to move into urban areas. Lane County also tried to bring rural youths into an urban work adjustment. Unfortunately, the data reported by the first two projects were not encouraging. Relatively few actually left the rural areas, and of those who did, half or more returned home within a very short time.

Lane County was also unique in defining the youths' problem as anomie. Its early experience indicated that simple lack of occupational skills and knowledge of the work world was not the central problem, that many of the youths it had recruited were not participating in its program either by avoiding all but the recreation, by repeatedly not keeping appointments, or by passively participating. To deal with anomie, it therefore changed its focus by stressing group experiences. It is not entirely clear how the program features, as evolved, are necessarily related to anomie, although project officials intended them to be.

Action Housing was also unique. in that its focus was as much on demonstrating the use of volunteer nonprofessionals as counselors as it was concerned with the counselees. Its program consisted almost entirely of arranging for volunteer nonprofessionals to counsel with young men in an MDTA program, in something like a big brother format. In doing this is provided some advisory help to the counselors, but otherwise left them free to evolve the kind of counseling styles and techniques which seemed best for each. The result was a good deal of heterogeneity; perhaps the most important program feature to be derived from this format was that counseling goals, emphases, and styles were varied to suit the individual characteristics of the counselees. The project reports, for example, that some of the trainees had a strong need for a father figure; others became suspicious and resentful of too much contact with their counselors; some needed dependency relationships; others to be independent.

COUNSELING PERSONNEL

There is a scarcity of information in the project reports about the qualifications and professional affiliations of counseling personnel. This section will deal briefly with the kinds of people that were used.

Professionals

In twenty-five projects, all or most of the formal counseling was done by professionals or those defining themselves as such. That is, they had college degrees, at the very least, and the degrees were in fields in, or related to, counseling or social work. In most of the twenty-five at least some of the staff had MA degrees, in counseling, social work, or related fields.

Professional credentials, however, are no criteria for excellence of counseling. One recorded counseling interview included in the appendix of one projects' report, presumably selected with some eye to its quality, reveals shockingly poor counseling technique. And one report cites a case of a youth who dropped out of the program after the counselor, a professional social worker, missed two consecutive appointments which the counselor herself had initiated! No professional sophistication is required to know that missing an appointment is the greatest single sin a counselor can commit against a client.

Nonprofessionals

Twenty projects made use of nonprofessionals in important counseling roles, ranging from group counselor aides (Lane County) to positions of complete responsibility for group counseling (JOBS). NCCY used a Negro nonprofessional to do all the follow-up work in home visits. Hunter's Point staffed its Motivation Center entirely with nonprofessionals, and the only counselor in the Temple program was a Negro nonprofessional. CPI used indigenous nonprofessionals as neighborhood workers (although a report prepared by such a worker is written in a highly professional manner), Detroit used nonprofessionals as Work Education Coordinators, Action Housing as counselors, and JOBS as group leaders. In each of these, the role filled by the nonprofessional was that of the integrator of various services for a particular youth. That is, the nonprofessionals were the principle contact persons for the clients. St. Louis JEVS, Lane County, and Neighborhood House used nonprofessionals as aides to the professional staff. YOB used college students to do follow-up telephoning during the summer vacation, while several projects used student volunteers to provide coaching and tutoring services in basic or remedial education.

Only one of the programs using subprofessionals was less than completely enthusiastic. Neighborhood House felt that some of its indigenous work-crew leaders tried to erect social barriers between themselves and the youths, to emphasize their high status positions.

It is worth noting that only two or three of the projects would have been able to operate at all had they insisted on MA degrees in counseling or social work for their counselors. Very few of the projects were able to recruit or pay for such a staff (especially at the pay levels set by Civil Service!), and had they been able to, they would have found their high-priced professionals so tied up in supportive activities and program management, as two projects reported, that they would have had very little time for counseling. Further, many program aspects, such as the field trips and follow-up visits, would have been impossible for most projects if they had not used subprofessionals. Thus, subprofessionals and nonprofessionals played essential roles in the projects.

Nevertheless, many projects skimped more than it was necessary or desirable on professional resources for consultation and supervision. The run-of-the-mill competence of most counseling personnel meant that few programs could call upon scholarly resources in research and sophisticated theory in designing their programs. Few projects had the kinds of intellectual talent which would have enabled them to make more sense out of their experiences, organize and codify their discoveries, strategies, and insights, and report them to the profession. Thus one function of the E and D program--to communicate the results of experience to other agencies--was severely restricted by the failure to provide for some top-level personnel.

Several projects made it a point to select all project personnel who were to have any contact with their youths for empathy, patience, understanding, and so forth. Thus KEY reports that even its bus drivers were selected for their personality characteristics, implicitly recognizing that they played a part in the counseling process. Such selection criteria were universal in the cases of work-crew leaders.

One project, YMCA, used nonprofessionals for all instruction. The project found that the professional educators they first tried were unsympathetic and schoolmarmish. They then eliminated the basic education instructors by using programmed instruction supervised by counselors, and exchanged their vocational instructors for indigenous craftsmen given extensive in-service training in teaching methods. These craftsmen were also purposely used to serve as role models of successful minority group members living in the same neighborhoods as the trainees.

Race

Several projects indicated that they felt the race of their counseling personnel to be important. YOB stressed a multi-racial staff with a heavy proportion of the same racial group as the clients; they assert that they had indications that other things being equal, such counselors developed closer relationships with the youths. Pinellas County also stressed its interracial staff, and felt that it played an important part in providing role models for both the white and the Negro trainees in its program.

Three other projects, St. Louis JEVS, Temple, and NCCY, indicated that as a means of increasing their effectiveness some of their staff were Negro. Neighborhood House employed local people for intake receptionist, secretaries, etc. It is likely that those subprofessionals described as indigenous were also largely Negro in such projects as CPI, MFY, JOBS, and Hunter's Point. One project (Neighborhood House) reported that it discovered, after a somewhat unproductive group counseling session, that the group had had more questions but had been unwilling to ask them, because the questions bore on race relations and their employment positions as Negroes, and the guest speaker before the group was white. However, another project (Detroit) felt that it was "not necessary" for counselors of Negro youths to be Negro. It quotes one of its youth's description of a Negro counselor as "one of them elites." Detroit's conclusion seems to be inappropriate; it would have been more accurate to say that being Negro is not a sufficient condition for being accepted by the youths.

One project (Action Housing) noted that counselors whose duties included home visits in slum areas should be males; it discovered that its famale volunteers were very reluctant to be out on the streets at night in the project's neighborhood.

There is now an extensive literature on the effect of Negro vs. white interviewers, testers, and group leaders on Negro subjects. Almost uniformly this research reports less anxiety and higher performance in Negro-Negro pairings than in racially mixed pairings.

SPECIFIC COUNSELING TECHNIQUES

In this section attention will be paid to more or less isolated methodologies, some bordering on gimmicks, which various projects reported using. The kinds of rewards and sanctions used to modify behavior will be considered, as well as other techniques in support of the counseling effort.

Placement Counseling

In most projects, placements were handled by members of a special job development and placement staff, rather than by counselors. As a result either very little advantage was taken of the placement-referral opportunity to do counseling, or what was done was not reported in the projects' reports (since counseling was usually described by some member of the counseling staff, and those who wrote the placement sections usually concentrated on their statistics).

Given the advantages of concrete in situ counseling as described above, particularly with reference to accompanying youths to job interviews, it is unfortunate that the placement situation was not more extensively used, for it is certainly at that time, when the youth is closest to his goal, that he is most highly motivated, most anxious to make a success of the placement, and most able to see the immediate and practical relevance of the counseling. Such immediacy and practical relevance are important components of counseling disadvantaged youths. When a youth is involved in role-playing an employment interview during his pre-vocational training, he is in effect being told: "Learn this now--it might come in handy some day." Years of having heard the same thing about only marginally relevant things in school have taught many youths to suspect such messages, especially when they have strong doubts that they will in fact be able to get a job. Such an implied message is not as likely to be as effective as the same counseling at the very moment when he is to be referred to a job.

Some projects did approximate this recommended format for placement counseling. Lane County's placement counselor held mock job interviews, including making and keeping appointments, filling out an application, and interviewing when the youth became "ready" for placement. After the mock procedures, the youth's performance was discussed with the counselor. In the PAL program, pre-vocational counseling was not formally scheduled in the special interest groups which the youths joined. However, it was discussed in any and all of the groups when it was relevant. The project reports that when some members of the group were appointed to be interviewed for jobs, the group discussion would almost naturally turn to a consideration of interview behavior, filling out applications, and the like. At Neighborhood House, an advanced counseling group of older men met in groups of about twelve twice a week to talk about job problems, to organize job searches, to screen want ads, etc.

KEY had one of the most highly developed systems for placement counseling as part of its placement procedures. First the placement man visited a prospective employer to get details about the job and to learn what he could about the employer. He would then describe the prospective employer to the trainee, rehearse the trainee in interview behavior, application filling, and the like, and send the trainee to the prospect. Following the trainee's interview with the prospective employer, the placement man would visit the employer for feedback and discuss this feedback with the trainee. The advantage of this procedure for providing the trainee with the support, understanding, and learning he needs is obvious. In this connection it should be noted that Neighborhood House had businessmen speak to their orientation groups and conduct mock job interviews, which the businessmen than criticized. Neighborhood House reports that the boys took the businessmen's comments, whom they saw as prospective employers, much more seriously than they did the comments of the counseling staff. It might be added that comments from such a source might not only seem more relevant--they might actually be more realistic, for counselors' ideas of good trainee interview behavior may not be identical to those of employers.

Kansas City JEVS also scheduled its placement counseling as an integral part of the placement process. The counselor would call prospective employers in the presence of the youth, describe the youth to the employer, make an appointment for the youth, and then discuss with the youth his approach to the forthcoming interview. This discussion also included role-playing with the counselor. The counselor also called the employer after the interview to get his impressions as a basis for further counseling with the youth, either as follow-up counseling or as placement counseling for those not hired the first time.

One of the problems with placement counseling is that in many cases it occurs so long after the youth has been admitted to a program that placement loses its ability to serve as an incentive. The counseling becomes so distant in time from its point of relevance that it loses effectiveness. This unfortunate situation occurred too often due to the general failure of the E and D projects in job development. NCCY suggests that the time to begin developing a job for a youngster is at the time he first enters the program. His participation in the job-development process would have great value as a teaching-counseling device and, once a job was staked out for him, it would make his training for it much more relevant and immediate to the youth. The Neighborhood House report states that training must be seen to have a pay-off and it is the lack of such pay-off, in many cases, that makes the youths appear unmotivated for training. One of the potentially most promising means of solving this problem is through the establishment of job banks, such as that arranged by St. Louis JEVS for its photo-finishing training. In effect, the project accepted an order from a local company to train photo-finishers. The result was that those entering the training had jobs waiting for them when they began training, and they were practically assured of jobs if they met training objectives. A more powerful and effective incentive would be hard to find. Such an arrangement allows the project to concentrate its efforts on what the youths need to keep jobs, rather than what they need to get a job. Much of the need for extensive teaching and counseling about interview behavior, application-filing, and the like, is removed, making a more efficient program. It seems likely that the actual job experience the youth gets upon completion of his training, with its opportunity to mature in the world of work, would include much incidental learning about job search methods, making job applications, etc., which might be useful for future job changes.

Follow-Up Counseling

While many projects described continued counseling
or other training programs, especially those youths who missed a session or were

often absent (although there were several projects which did not even do this much). Such activity is so basic that little more need be said about it except that not enough of it was done. More innovative, and of potentially greater importance, are the arrangements made for post-placement counseling. It is with these arrangements that this section will deal.

As indicated earlier, post-placement counseling was minimal in the E and D projects. Except for a few isolated instances (in the programs of PAL and MFY, and the more formalized programs in Draper and YMCA) little attention was paid to follow-up either for information-gathering, for counseling for job tenure, or for career development. This was true even among projects which included follow-up work as part of their contract obligations to OMAT. Follow-up is seldom seen as an integral part of counseling, although there are reasons for thinking that follow-up counseling may be the most efficacious. Counselors do not like to do follow-up (perhaps because it raises the possibility that a case which the counselor felt had been successfully closed would be found to be still open, or less successful than the counselor would have liked to think). In any case, given the press of demands on counselor time, most in the E and D projects seem to have opted for taking the time from follow-up and putting it into pre-placement activities.

One project recognized the need for follow-up work, and was obligated to do it by the terms of its contract. It further noted that many boys lost the jobs on which they had been placed through misunderstandings about such things as payroll deductions, social security, overtime computation, sick leave, and the like and would impulsively quit or fight with their employers on the assumption that the employer was cheating them. Such an assumption is not unreasonable to such youths, for they have had extensive experience of unfair treatment by employers through members of their families and their communities. One project (Lorton) found that an employer, who hired on of their trainees, was in fact cheating him. Given this suspicion, then, and the fact that counseling about such matters is likely to be more effective when it is counseling about a real salary and a real withholding tax, rather than a hypothetical one, there is obvious need for post-placement counseling. Nevertheless, in the project which reported recognition of such problems, the only such counseling done was that instigated by the youths themselves.

Two other factors make this neglect of post-placement counseling especially regrettable: Neighborhood House notes that youths with job experience appear to better understand the need for training, suggesting that post-placement counseling could be effective in encouraging youths to take training and in helping to make the necessary arrangements. This would be more efficient than counselors spending many hours trying to convince youths of their need for training who come looking for jobs.[3]

The second operative factor is that once placed on jobs, youths tend not to return spontaneously for counseling, especially if they are having difficulties on the job. It is difficult to know if their failure to keep follow-up appointments represents an attempt to avoid admitting difficulty to their counselors, of if the youths, too inexperienced to recognize the danger signals, are unaware of the difficulty they are having. In any case, both MFY and Kansas City JEVS report that they tend not to come back for follow-up counseling until they have already been fired. Then, they come back for a new placement, rather than for counseling.

OMAT's resistance to providing funds for post-placement counseling and follow-up for more than three months, therefore, is an unfortunate limitation which may inhibit projects from developing what could well be the most effective kind of counseling programs.

Kansas City JEVS follow-up program seemed appropriate to deal with youths who do not recognize developing difficulties on the job. These youths are given follow-up appointments, after working hours, in the first week on the job. The counselor asks the youth to tell him all about the job--work, foreman, co-workers, etc.--hoping that any potential trouble spots will reveal themselves. The counselor also telephones the youth's parents to make suggestions about ways they might be able to help the youth get to work on time, eat adequately, etc. The counselor also contacts the youth's employer at the same time to get his view of the youth's performance and to encourage him to retain the youth. The policy of the New Jersey OEO (which otherwise did very little follow-up) was never to contact a youth's employer without the youth's permission. That seems very reasonable and fair; it is likely that most young people would give such permission, but there is little justification for a project intruding in this area without their approval.

---

[3] The greater receptivity of employed youths to the need for training may well be simply a function of age and maturity. Several of the projects noted that the older boys seemed much more highly motivated for training than the younger ones; it is likely that those who have had work experience are older than those who have not. Age and age-related changes in the life situation rather than work experience itself may account for this greater receptivity. This is an empirical question which could be answered by many methods.

Kansas City JEVS continued to call the youths' employers about once a month. The project notes that the employers seemed pleased by this continued interest, by the support implied by such calls, and by the implicit recognition of his public spirit that the project was giving him. The project also encouraged each youth to come in once a month for counseling, but many did not respond to this opportunity. Kansas City JEVS notes that those who did preferred to drop in without appointment, probably as a way of informalizing the relationship. They, possibly, were beginning to see themselves as independent working men, and trying to escape the subordinate-role position of a counselee by not making appointments which would make the counseling relationship explicit, and by treating the interviews as friendly chats between equals about the problems of working men.

A similar informality developed in Neighborhood House, where one of the counselors made it a practice to stay late one or two days a week. Boys on their way home from work would see his car in front of the center and would drop in to say hello. As a result there was often an informal group of a dozen boys in the counselor's office discussing their work experiences. Such spontaneous and natural counseling, relying so much on the resources and initiative of the counselee, is very desirable; the problem is to find a structure which can preserve this naturalness while achieving broader coverage of all those placed in jobs.

Springfield Goodwill also had a well-developed follow-up program, which was sold as a package to potential employers. The package included follow-up visits to the employer by the placement man to talk with and counsel the employer on the spot, regularly scheduled follow-up counseling with the youth, and scheduled follow-up visits to the youth's home by the project social worker. The boys were very pleased to have the project continue its interest in them as manifested by the placement man's visit to the work place. However, the boys did not keep their appointments at the project for follow-up counseling until the project negotiated with the employers to provide released time during the day for that specific purpose. This is an important feature worthy of imitation. Another project occasionally called employers to ask them to put pressure on a youth to keep his follow-up appointment. This not only makes it impossible to secure the youth's permission before contacting the employer, but also runs the risk of adding to whatever job difficulties the youth might have. Since this was the usual reason for having the youth return for counseling, following a regularly scheduled weekly telephone check-up with all the employers of project youths, suggesting to the employer that the youth is not even trying to solve his problems and is ungrateful for the help given him by the project, compounds the problem.

Draper had an extensive follow-up program, in which the counselor visited each parolee's employer, family, and home community. The counselor arranged for the parolees to have access to community services and institutions, which the counselor had scouted in advance. The counselor helped the parolee make adjustments when there were difficulties in living arrangements or in the employment situation. In several cases the follow-up counselor was able to prevent the loss of a job, which would have been an automatic parole violation requiring the parolee to be remanded to prison. The entire annual salary of the follow-up counselor could be thought of as having been paid by the amount the state saved in not having to remand those parolees, to say nothing of the income taxes contributed to the economy by the employed parolees.

The only other well-developed follow-up program among the E and D projects was that of YMCA, which included regular monthly follow-up to help guide its youths through the first six months of employment. YMCA also developed an Alumni Club which it used as a means of access to former trainees for job-upgrading counseling and career development.

At PAL, a youth's counseling, during his participation in the project, is arranged to simply blend into follow-up and career development counseling after placement. In effect, the fact of placement, especially for a youth for whom short-term and part-time placements have been arranged as counseling resources, does not alter his relationship to the project.

Rewards and Sanctions

Projects were narrowly limited in the rewards and sanctions they were able to manipulate and control, outside of job placement itself and, given the poor quality of most of the jobs, the reward value of such placements was poor. Nevertheless, most of the youths who came to the E and D projects did so in search of jobs. This made it possible for projects to use final placement as an ultimate reward and to use clear signs of progress toward that goal as proximal goals functioning as secondary reinforcers. Such would be the theoretical basis implied, for example, by PAL's technique of discussing job search techniques in the very first intake group counseling session, so that the youths would be getting some part of what they came for, and would be more likely to return for further services. This use of rewards is also implied in those programs which tried to break down long-range goals into more concrete and immediate goals, and to interpret the youth's experiences and his plans in relations to those goals, always keeping them relevant to the eventual goal of full-time employment (Pinellas County, YOB, PAL, and CPI).

CPI employed the notion of placement-associated intermediate rewards in another way: it broke its Neighborhood Youth Corps placements down into a junior and senior level. Promotion to the senior level did not involve any salary increase, but it did allow the youths to work longer hours and to earn more money at the hourly rate, thus functioning as an incentive to the boys at the junior level and as a reward for them.

Not to participate in a program means failure to a youth. Yet many are afraid to participate because they are afraid of the ultimate test--getting and keeping a job. Lane County's report suggests that agencies try to avoid making non-participation mean failure, although it was difficult for Lane County to do so. Project staff are highly committed to their programs, and it is difficult for them to hide their disappointment, and in some cases resentment, against youths who appear reluctant to use the program; such reluctance is interpreted as evidence of lack of job readiness, low motivation, and other accusatory diagnoses, in the pattern of turning the problem back on the youth. This further drives him away from the program and from remaining accessible to help. It is enough that nonparticipation does not produce rewards in progress toward employment and financial gain; it need not go to the extreme of involving implied punishment.

Several projects used other kinds of rewards, such as graduation diplomas (Pinellas County, YMCA, Neighborhood House) and awards for outstanding trainees in public ceremonies (YMCA). Draper took photos of the youths for use in public relations, and gave copies of the photos to the trainees as rewards for performance. Draper also used very small monetary rewards for some performances.

Several other projects used monetary rewards. For example, CPI negotiated periodic wage increases with on-the-job training employers to function as incentives. Philadelphia JEVS gave periodic salary increments to its trainees in the sheltered workshop and found that, in fact, their productivity generally kept pace with their wage level, suggesting that the youths were quite responsive to financial incentives. ABCD recommends that similar incentives be built into on-the-job training contracts through periodic raises. In this connection it is worth noting MFY's recommendation that as a youth progresses through on-the-job training, a proportionately greater share of the contract costs ought to be borne by the employer, on the assumption that the youth's productivity, value, and utility to the employer increases. This suggestion has much to recommend it. It is possible that the employer's gradual assumption of the full costs of training would not only increase the employer's commitment to the trainee, but also make it easier for the employer to continue the trainee as a regular employee, since a continuation would not produce a sudden drain on his payroll.

Unfortunately, the conditions under which MDTA funds for pay and allowances are administered severely limited projects in their ability to manipulate financial incentives and rewards. For example, several projects suggest that, at least at first, disadvantaged youths are not ready to put in full days in training programs, but that the need to pay the trainees at a standard rate meant that the less experienced trainees would either be paid for hours he didn't work--

hardly a good training experience--or would have to work full time. Lane County and VAS-Altro recommend that it be made possible for some youths to not put in full working weeks at the beginning of their programs, and that their pay and allowances be adjusted accordingly. Graduation to a full work week, then, would function as an incentive; under present circumstances, since the allowances remain the same while the amount of work increases, it functions as a negative incentive.

Several projects found it possible to dock the pay of trainees, and this was a populat way of treating absences and latenesses (St. Louis JEVS, JOBS, YOB, Neighborhood House, PEPSY). ABCD also tried docking, but this led to demonstrations against the project and the plan was scrapped. YOB found that docking pay for absences had no effect on attendance in basic education. In NCCY, youths fined themselves for lateness to group meetings with an elected sergeant-at-arms to collect the money, which was later used for a graduation party. There is a need for further data on attendance in programs which do and do not dock pay or charge fines, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of these devices. It would probably also be desirable to compare programs which require attendance with those that do not to discover wheat effect, if any, these things have on learning.

Docking pay for lateness and absence was a response to a problem with which almost all the E and D projects were faced: absence and lateness were held responsible for 30 percent of the program dropouts from Philadelphia JEVS and JOBS, and many other projects mentioned it as one of their most difficult problems. YOB cited the missed appointments as one of their difficult problems and indicated that one reason many of the younger trainees were difficult to place was that they "forgot" to show up for job appointments. JOY also found getting kids to keep appointments was one of the project's most difficult tasks. The St. Louis JEVS reports that those who missed their interview appointments didn't get the jobs. Many projects tried group counseling units on the value of promptness and reliability, and instituted sanctions for lateness and absence, which suggests that the counseling alone was not effective.

Unfortunately, almost no projects reported data that would permit interpretation of lateness and absence, and the data presented are difficult to interpret.

For example, those whose irregular attendance led to dropping out of the St. Louis JEVS program and turned out to have "cleaner" delinquency records than those who remained. Philadelphia JEVS reports that, in fact, only 10 percent of the youths they sent on job referrals failed to keep their appointments--a percentage comparable to that of adults referred from employment service offices to job openings. Thus it is difficult to know whether the failure to keep appointments is really common among disadvantaged youths. If it is, it is not known if such failure is concentrated among the younger boys, as was suggested by YOB. The counseling-training programs of the E and D projects are probably least appropriate for this age group, so that failure to attend may be simply a symptom of the irrelevance of the training to the needs and wishes of the group, rather than a reflection of some idiosyncratic characteristic of disadvantaged youths, or of "lack of motivation."

It is possible that lateness (which readily becomes an absence once the youth realizes that he is late) may be caused by the inability to tell time. Only one project inquired into this and found that one quarter of the youths could not tell time accurately (Philadelphia JEVS). Are these the same youths who are often late? No project seemed to have asked whether there were clocks and watches in the youths' homes.

Finally, no data were collected which pinpointed the occasions for lateness and absence. Philadelphia JEVS suggests that the youth's absences seemed to express the fear of failure which arises when they are to enter a new activity. Does failure to keep appointments for job interviews occur as often for apparently good jobs with good salaries as it does in the case of entry-level, or manual labor type jobs? Here is another context in which E and D agencies seem not to have considered the incentive feature of the problem of promptness and attendance, and instead have ascribed the problem to characteristics of the youths rather than to the situations to which youths were responding. Instead of trying to modify or change such situations, they imposed sanctions on the youth in an effort to make them change.

This is one of the results of the E and D agencies' failure to collect data carefully enough to make the nature of their problems discoverable and thus to help create appropriate solutions. Questionable impressions, without any base for comparison of frequencies, have had to substitute for even simple counts of occurrences. Many projects' decision to skimp on research in the interest of providing more services, in this case at least, may also have meant that they provided poorer, or less appropriate, service.

Nevertheless, several projects stressed the importance of pay and allowances as incentives. Neighborhood House and Lane County agree that many youths would never have entered their programs had it not been for the pay and allowances. Springfield Goodwill reported that when its trainees were given paid status, their work performance radically improved; Philadelphia JEVS reported exactly the same thing. And UL-NAACP found that, until it was able to obtain allowances for its trainees, they distrusted the counselors and were constantly suspicious that they were being taken for a ride. So important were pay and allowances that the Skills Center's policy of distributing pay checks in counseling groups meant that the staff and the group counseling were almost disastrously undermined, in the eyes of the boys, by the failure of the checks to arrive on time. (This latter was an almost universal experience; it is almost beyond comprehension how impossible it apparently was for the federal government to pay the youths on time, despite all kinds of promises and efforts. No other factor was more detrimental to the E and D projects than this universal failure. In some cases, the projects never fully recovered from the damage their reputations suffered among the youths they were trying to attract. Huge investments of staff time and energy were spent in trying to compensate for the damage. Time which could have been better used in working with the youths. This may have been the single factor most responsible for project dropouts.

Given the evidence of the youth's responsiveness to financial incentive, including productivity, one can only marvel that the lack of motivation myth has proved so hardy. Projects seemed designed to provide the youths with opportunities to do almost everything but earn enough money to justify their efforts. As Kansas City JEVS noted, some of its clients were ambivalent about working; they were not sure that it was worth the effort for the small amount they could earn on the jobs available. As a tool for getting youths to work, is as weak a reed as psychological counseling adequate or justified, without adequate or worthwhile financial incentives? In the absence of economic programs increasing such wage incentives, projects like the E and D program are in danger of trying to become a means of maintaining a cheap labor supply in a labor market that many potential workers would otherwise refuse to enter for such wages. The only insurance that the E and D program can have against serving such a function is its effort to ensure that good jobs with adequate salaries are available to its trainees; yet it is this insurance which is most specifically lacking in the program. With such insurance, there would be less need to ask counseling and programming to do a job for which they are ill-suited.

It is also remarkable that, despite project recognition of the importance of pay when it failed to arrive on time, none used the occasion of dispersing checks for counseling as did the CPI work-crew leader whose boys opened bank accounts. Projects lectured youths about economy and spending wisely, but few used the actual receipt of money as the take-off point for engaging in concrete discussion of money management.

Group Counseling Methods and Techniques

One of the most distinctive features of the E and D projects was the development of group counseling. While such a counseling format has been available for years, the context in which such counseling takes place has not operated as strongly as the E and D project in making group counseling a logical and necessary solution. The mystique associated with group counseling aside, the existence of projects with classes in such matters as interview behavior, manners, and grooming made group counseling an almost inevitable development.

Group counseling (it existed in some form in every one of the projects) ranged from group sessions with rigid curricula hardly different from usual classroom instruction to free and open discussion of feelings that approached group psychotherapy. This range, and the difficulty in making any meaningful discrimination between counseling and training, makes it impossible to summarize adequately all of the projects' experiences. Comments from project reports will be briefly collected and listed under three headings: (1) Groupings for Counseling;

(2) Counseling Methods; (3) Group Supports. The recommendations which follow should not be relied on too heavily as few reflect any consensus among the projects, as none is the product of formal research and, in most cases, are not even the result of informal experimentation. Most of these observations could be the result of idiosyncratic skills, or limitations, of the group leader making the recommendation, or of local idiosyncracies in the youths, or of special features of the projects.

Groupings

Projects grouped youths for counseling in many different ways. In some cases, they were grouped according to the stage of their progress through the program (e.g., pre-vocational groups, vocational counseling groups, advanced groups, follow-up groups); in others, according to the part of the program they were in, defining some common activity (e.g., basic education groups, work-crew groups, OJT trainee groups, etc.).

In most projects, the youths were isolated from others not in the project. In four programs (VAS-Altro, Davis Goodwill, Kansas City JEVS, CPI) some or all of the youths were mixed with other older, more experienced workmen. All four arranged this mixing on the theory that the older workers would serve as role models and supports for the youths. VAS-Altro felt that this facilitated training, compared to compact bodies of disadvantaged youths working together. (YMCA noted a tendency for groups of youths to set their own norms, to which all members tried to adhere, even if it meant cheating on tests.) VAS-Altro felt that the older workers provided more reasonable standards, and would be better able to deal with individuals who were not performing up to expectation.

Other mixtures recommended by the projects were the mixing of younger and older boys, so that older boys could operate as a stablilzing and more serious influence on the younger ones (New Jersey OEO), a notion which receives some support from the frequent observation that the younger trainees--16 and 17 years old--were the most unstable, immature, and impulsive (New Jersey OEO, Pinellas County, YOB). PAL recommends mixing married and unmarried boys in a group for the same reason. It is difficult to know whether this is really based on marital status or on correlated age differences.

It was the younger trainees who asked for a job--any job, who were most resistant to training (Skills Center), and who had the highest project dropout rates (Des Moines, JOBS). It seems likely that these young out-of-school youths desperately wanted both something to do with their time and pocket money. They are too immature to think further than that. Schooling, as a way of passing the days agreeably and in a manner which is socially justifiable, is closed to them by the failure and psychological punishment that school means to them.[4] In their immaturity about career planning they are probably not different from middle-class adolescents except they lack school as a way of postponing career decisions, and they are in greater need of money. They are unlikely to be receptive to the kinds of training offered in E and D projects until they are a few years older and occupy social positions requiring increased responsibility, an increasingly serious turn of mind, and have had enough of the thrills and play of the middle-adolescent years. They are at or past the age of graduation from the neighborhood gangs at nineteen, but until then they are still dependent on group support, and wrapped up in enjoying the freedom of their age. For such youths, placement in temporary and short-term jobs is probably the best that can be done, especially since work experience tends to make young people more appreciative of the need for training. Such placement would give the youngsters some of the experience of playing work roles which projects otherwise have had to simulate through role-playing. As MFY noted, it sometimes takes several placements before a youth learns enough about the world of work to keep a good job. Such placement would demonstrate to the youths that the project has jobs, so they would stay in touch with the project. Counseling concurrently with their work would not only be a more concrete and realistic solution, but would serve as a catalyst for more mature career planning and goal-setting as the youth matures.

There are thus many advantages in getting the younger youths into contact with the E and D projects. Therefore, it is an error for projects to require youths to be out of school for one full year before they may receive pay and allowances for participation in project activities. No doubt this requirement was originally designed to prevent the pay and allowances from serving as incentives to drop out of school. However, there has been sufficient research on the determinants of dropping out of school to indicate that few, if any, would drop out in order to get MDTA allowances. These might serve as the excuses for dropping out, but seldom as the reasons.

---

[4] It is interesting to note that Lane County trainees persisted in referring to the project as "school," probably because they wanted it to be thought of as having the same status and legimating function for them that school has for other adolescents.

YOB recommends that groups not contain too many very shy, reticent, or nonverbal youngsters, or too many youths who say they want jobs instead of talk. They also recommend that the group contain one or two cooperative and highly verbal members to start the ball rolling. JOY also found that both withdrawn, passive, and nonverbal youths and boisterous aggressive types were unsuitable for group counseling. YOB noted that boys found it difficult to talk about some matters (e.g., delinquency records) if there were too many naive youngsters in the group.

Several programs imply the virtue of some kind of commonality among group members. MFY asserts this as a criterion for group counseling, and by and large, its groups were built around common training assignments (e.g., all OJT trainees in the same department store, all trainees in the teacher-aide program, members of the same work teams, etc.). MFY even tried to arrange group OJT placements, so that the members of the group could lend each other support while on the job. YMCA stressed composing groups of those in the same skill training, so that the conversation in the groups could be maximally relevant to the work-training and to the needs of workers in that field.

Group Methods

Some projects organized their groups with definite starting and ending dates (for example, to coincide with the beginning and end of a cycle of training, of an MDTA course, etc.). In other cases, groups were kept free-flowing, with new members being fed into the groups from time to time, while older members moved on (e.g., Skills Center). This kind of arrangement was most often used for intake groups (sometimes also called pre-vocational groups). Neighborhood House started with the former kind of group and switched to the latter, so that youths could be taken into the program as soon as they registered with the agency. Other projects switched from individual intake to either of the two formats (PAL to the defined beginning and end type, for example, and Lane County to the continuous type). One program used a modified continuous program: NMU held over some youths from one cycle to the next, in effect to "seed" each group with experienced trainees.

One problem with the fixed limits group is, according to Lane County, that the youths are reluctant to begin all over again in a more advanced group with a different counselor when they are moved into another phase of the program. MFY also found some difficulty in weaning youths from their groups. Lane County tried to solve the problem by team counseling, in which the prevocational counselor and the vocational counselor cooperatively shared the group, so that for the individual counselee there was no sudden shift to a new counselor. MFY handled the problem by assigning youths from the work crews to independent work while they continued in the group counseling, thus making their withdrawal from the group gradual.

One advantage of continuous groupings is that it permits certain kinds of pressures to operate, such as that exerted by the graduation of a member who succeeds in getting a job.

Some programs had highly structured group curricula so tightly formalized as to be more appropriately called classes. Counselors in three projects operated from a set of detailed curricular outlines issued by a central office. The curricula these projects mentioned appears vacuous, irrelevant, and superficial; although it is always possible that an inspired teacher may have been able to make them come alive. Such curricula cannot be responsive to the immediate needs of the youths and they lose the virtue of concreteness and relevance. Further, in all three cases, each curriculum went far beyond a direct vocational objective and tried to teach precepts of upright and moral living. There seems little likelihood that such teaching can have any effect. It almost goes without saying that the youths did not like such structured programs (Lane County).

Somewhat less structured were those groups with specific programs but with opportunity for free discussion and response to the presentation. Most of the group counseling seemed to be of this type, with the groups hearing speakers, role-playing, seeing films about jobs and work, engaging in discussions about specific problems with which they are challenged, or organizing themselves for site visits, and cultural enrichment programs. Most projects report that the youths became involved in such programs and occasionally displayed a good deal of interest and excitement. However, if the JOBS follow-up can be generalized, they do not find such programs particularly useful in moving them toward their primary goal of employment.

At the other extreme are the extremely loose groups in which any and every topic which might seem to be of interest to the youths is brought up for discussion. Such programs usually draw heavily on the mystique associated with group dynamics, but often in a rather naive way. What seems to get overlooked in many group dynamics programs is the development of a focus or reason for the group to interact. That is, the form, without its justifying content, has been taken over; the result tends to be a rather chaotic succession of sessions, each bearing little relation to the other, and few bearing any relation to the question of employability. The JOBS project is most characterized by this kind of group counseling program, but even there it was pointed out that some kind of schedule is needed to make sure that the group does not leave out any important topics. One technique for running such a group, described by JOBS, is for a group leader to listen in on the informal conversation of the group while it awaits him for clues about what the group is interested in. Too great a reliance on the shifting interests of the group members runs the danger of dwelling excessively on topics of great interest. Yet such topics can be used to avoid realities which are more immediate, more concrete, and more threatening. Idle conversation may reflect at least passing interests but does not always relate to any of the employment-related problems to be solved.

Pinellas County and Springfield Goodwill also found that aimless drift in totally permissive group meetings required scheduling as a corrective. One sheltered workshop found that its group sessions had degenerated into loud quarrels, baiting of the staff, and complaints about the program. The counselor reacted by instituting a very tightly controlled curriculum, which he was then gradually able to relax to permit freer participation by the youths. To some extent this problem may have grown out of the counselor's uncertainty about the role and function of the group counseling. Another project found its groups becoming quite chaotic, largely devoted to recriminations and complaints about the program. This project felt that a part of the difficulty was the staff's inability to integrate its desire to give information and opinions honestly and openly and its commitment to the passive role of client-centered theory.

Very few counselors, particularly at the semi-professional level which characterized most of the E and D projects, have had much, if any, supervised experience or training in group methods, and the uniform lack of supervisory time and resources in all the E and D projects (except for YMCA) could not help the matter.

The unique group counseling program in the E and D projects was an intensive two-day group developed by YOB for intake counseling. These groups ran a full eight hours for each of two days, with a lunch break. It is claimed that the intensive atmosphere and the deep immersion facilitates serious commitment to the program, that the youths become "involved" faster, and that defenses and hesitancies melt away while the group quickly develops an esprit. YOB feels that such groups aided in the later formation of relationships with individual counselors, and that the intensive groups continued to meet together, as groups, longer than those which functioned primarily for information giving and receiving. However, the YOB reports are inconsistent about the value of such groups; YOB II reports that it abandoned the intensive two-day groups in favor of individual intake because the youths needed invididual attention, which contradicts an earlier assertion that the existence of the groups facilitated the development of individual relations between counselors and clients.

Action Housing used a similar intensive format, except that its groups went for four days.

PAL's intake groups were based on a number of interesting principles: the first meeting discussed job search techniques. That, and subsequent meetings, used many posters, handouts, and other visual aids. The use of such aids was gradually diminished in order to ease the group into more and more spontaneous participation by the youths. The counselor tried to give some new information related to job getting in each meeting so that the meetings always contained some intrinsic rewards. Finally, the counselor made it a point to continually define his role while he encouraged each of the group members to continuously define his goals.

In some projects, the groups were quite task-oriented. JOBS, for example, gave group members assignments to study such questions as how they would invest $1,000 in business in a Negro community. The group members were to go out into the community and interview shopkeepers and businessmen for their judgments and to gather information about the economic conditions of the community. One of the ultimate aims of such as assignment is to help youths to learn about the jobs in their neighborhoods, and the futures of various jobs. The groups also did research on the history of a particular company, branching out to the histories of related trades and industries, in order to learn something of the way in which jobs and labor markets change. KEY also used a project of this sort. During the summer it organized its program of cultural enrichment around the study of vacations. The youths visited transportation centers, collected and read tourist literature, prepared itineraries, and estimated costs. The idea was to whet their appetite for remaining stably enough employed to get paid vacations. The results were negative; many youths decided to take their vacations there and then and disappeared from the project.

JOBS used a committee format in some of its groups, with rotating chairmanships, so that each member of the group got a chance to speak for his sub-group in reporting before the larger group. JOBS reports that a spirit of friendly competition developed among the groups, and that there was considerable pride in representing a group and speaking for it. However, they found it necessary to reshuffle the group memberships from time to time to prevent clique formation.

Lane County also tried task-oriented groups, in which each group was to plan and complete a task--any task, so long as the group could get some success experience in completing a task. However, groups do not always choose tasks they can reasonably expect to complete, it is difficult to get them to choose reasonable and relevant tasks, and the result can be that, instead of a success experience, there is failure and frustration.

This problem also afflicted the STAY groups developed by Lane County (Sensitivity Training for Alienated Youth). Their intention was to develop, conceptualize, and execute tasks as a group, so that positive experiences for an individual would be entirely dependent upon group interaction. These groups were trainee-led and were based on the idea that the responsibility for getting a task done was squarely on the youths, who would see their peers and themselves in adult roles. What is missing is the relevance of the tasks to employability, and which adult roles the youths would experience.

Lane County reports that the trainees in such groups related more easily to staff members, and were more willing to be responsible for themselves without supervision.

One JOBS counselor used shocking statements, quotations, or news events to stimulate group conversation. A similar device was used by a counselor at Neighborhood House who came to a meeting dressed the way the Apache Indians dress on the reservation, in order to stimulate discussion about why dress appears strange in the wrong context, and why it is necessary to conform in one's clothing. At JOBS, after a group meeting devoted to the meaning of evaluation, some groups periodically evaluated the staff members and themselves to learn that it is possible to give and take criticism without a loss of respect. Neighborhood House also had its groups criticize their curriculum at the end of the pre counseling phase. In Action Housing, the group members took and interpreted tests in the group, as a self-confrontation device.

PAL organized a leadership group, a set of occupational interest groups, remedial groups, and groups of neighborhood friends, clients could select any, all, or none for membership. Neighborhood House had a group of older boys to organize and plan job searches. One counselor also had occasional group meetings with all his counselees to discuss matters of common interest as they seemed appropriate. Pinellas County confronted its race problem in a series of special group meetings with white and Negro trainees which lasted far into the night, to allow the youths to ventilate their feelings freely. Neighborhood House found that in the early meetings of their pre-vocational groups there was an intensive airing of Black Muslim sentiments, but that this subsided as the groups got to work.

At Neighborhood House a counselor joined with the parole officer in scheduled group meetings with those project youths who were on parole; one of the ideas was to show that the counselor and the parole officer could work together in the youths' interest.

Lane County tried an audience counseling method, in which a staff member did an intake counseling interview with a youth in front of the group.

Neighborhood House tape recorded some of the group meetings, and then played the tapes so that the group members could criticize their own participation and develop confidence in themselves for participation in job interviews.

Group Supports

The major justification for the emphasis on group methods in E and D projects is that peer pressures are more effective in inducing changes of attitude and behavior than are pressures from staff. Several projects were cited earlier as claiming that when one member of a group was referred to a placement or got a job, there was a marked increase in the motivation to work on the part of the other members of the group (JOBS, Skills Center, Neighborhood House). Pinellas County reports that peer pressure was more effective than staff pressure; the youths did not attend grooming classes, but group pressure resulted in improvement in dress. NCCY relates an incidental aspect of its trial of Berlitz total immersion. Several youths were immersed in English classes at Berlitz for thirteen hours a day for several weeks. One of the observations reported was that, in the Berlitz school milieu with its many affluent students, the project youths mixed fairly freely with the well-dressed, sophisticated students, The result, with nothing said directly, was that several of the project youths spontaneously began to appear in shirts, ties, and suit jackets.

Other claims made for the virtues of the group methods is that group counseling boys relate better to staff members in individual counseling and are more willing to be responsible for themselves (Lane County) and that older and more mature youths help in stabilizing the behavior of the younger and more impulsive youths (New Jersey OEO).

The major negative effect cited was the development of powerful group norms, or adaptation levels, with conformity pressures more powerful and insidious than can be invoked even by an authoritarian staff. Such norms are not necessarily any more appropriate to the needs of a particular group member than any other externally-applied norms. Thus the group pressures can operate negatively as well as positively. In the YMCA program it was found, for example, that such group norms greatly erode the value of the self-pacing feature, which they had carefully built into their programmed instruction materials.

Miscellaneous Techniques and Practices

Project reports were generally less communicative about the specific techniques used in individual counseling. They more often described the general orientation and aims of the counselors and counseling, but seldom introduced or discussed the specific steps taken by the counselor to implement the orientation.

The role of counselors in the E and D agencies had many parts which involved them much more extensively in the lives of their clients than has been typical of vocational counseling. For example, in several projects (particularly NMU and Pinellas County) the counselors engaged in recreational activities with the youths, in team sports and the like, primarily to demonstrate to the youths that the counselors liked them beyond the demands of their official positions. In one big city program, counselors were initially required to live in the trainees' neighborhoods so that counselors could be accessible after hours in case of emergency, and could become known in the neighborhood. Unfortunately, some of the nonprofessional counselors apparently overstepped the lines required for good working relationships, in such matters as drinking with trainees, dating them, and the like, and the requirement was abandoned--especially as it turned out that the trainees did not, in fact, call on the counselors after hours, except in rare cases (e. g. , a trainee who had no place to sleep at night, or a trainee in CPI who was thrown out of his home by rejecting parents).

At Neighborhood House, MFY, and several other projects, counselors visited youths who had been incarcerated in order to demonstrate interest in the youths and to lay the groundwork for their return to the project. In New Jersey OEO, VAS-Altro, Detroit, and CPI, counseling personnel accompanied youths to the agencies where they were referred for particular purposes (e. g., psychotherapy, dental or medical care) if it reduced their anxiety and enabled them to make better use of the referral agency. At Neighborhood House, the Employment Service representative attached to the project made it a point to go out into the streets near the project center to pass the time of day with the boys who hung around, so that he became a familiar figure to the local residents. The Work Education Coordinators in the Detroit program served as "big brothers" to their trainees, representing them in court, arranging babysitting, negotiating raises, and goading placement into finding jobs for them.

Neighborhood House used photographs extensively in support of its programs. It took before and after pictures of boys who got haircuts and posted them. The project took candid snapshots of the boys in various activities to post, to call attention to how they looked, as a way of getting them to think about their appearance. The project also provided money for one haircut for each boy.

One interesting use of photos was made for a work project. In order to counter the reluctance of the youths to be seen doing menial stoop labor as part of a community clean-up campaign, the project took many publicity photos of the youths at work, particularly showing them using rented power equipment, which increased the prestige of the work.

KEY also stressed the use of sophisticated machines (e. g., electric typewriters, transcription machines, etc.), in order to stress the adult quality of the work roles for which they were training the youths.

The Skills Center made an interesting use of the center's location to achieve some of the goals of the program. The center was located near a ghetto neighborhood, but also close to the major work centers of the city. The idea was that youths coming from the ghetto to the Skills Center would be travelling in the same general direction as their elders going to work thus reinforcing their self-concepts as working people while requiring them to leave the ghetto. The Skills Center also points out that the center should not be so flossy that it puts the youths off by appearing untouchable. This is an important point, the youths could feel that it represents a style of life and a level of society which is completely outside their experience and beyond anything they could reasonably reach. This seems to have been the case at a college-based program where trainees were housed in dormitories. The project reports that this involved a way of life so foreign to the youths that future programs operated by the university will avoid that feature.

The Detroit project counselor stresses making the counseling office as different as possible from those associated with school counseling. Desks, file cabinets, and straight-back chairs were banished in favor of the informal atmosphere of easy chairs and a table. Each client came to the office for at least one fifteen minute appointment simply to become familiar with the place, and to give him an opportunity to "feel out" the counselor.

MFY found that its counselors did a better job if their case loads were all drawn from the same aspect of the program, rather than at random. They used two platoons: (1) those whose clients were in subsidized work (e.g., work crews, sheltered workshop, Neighborhood Youth Corps); and (2) those whose clients were working independently (e.g., on-the-job training and direct job placements). However, the problems of communication between the work supervisors and the counselors were not adequately solved, and it seems likely that the counseling lost much of its immediacy.

One project noted a conflict between staff specialization, in which a youth works with several staff members at different stages of his progress through the program; and staff generalization, in which one counselor serves the youth in all functions. The project elected the latter course, but was not able to solve the problem of making sure that each counselor knew all that needed to be known about developments in each area. It is possible that a format using specialized counselors would operate better, provided that each youth had a nonprofessional as his general factotum, to bridge the gaps among the specialists, and to help the client use each appropriately.

Supportive techniques used in many of the counseling programs included the following: role-playing (almost entirely of job interviews, eleven projects); films (nine projects); site visits to places of training and employment (eleven projects); lectures from outside speakers (eight projects). PAL developed an athletic program, as did the Skills Center. The latter also organized a jazz band. The idea was to give the community exposure to disadvantaged youths in a context drawing attention to their abilities and talents and, at the same time, requiring the youths to expose themselves to the larger community and learn some of its ways.

Role-playing was a particularly popular technique and one which seems quite appropriate for relatively nonverbal youths. Although there was no objective evaluation of the effectiveness of role-playing, KEY did not find that the appearance, clothing, or health habits of its trainees were affected by their discussions of the mock interview behavior of the trainees.

One device that was used with great frequency in E and D projects was that of having youths prepare their own personal data files, containing all the kinds of information which might be required of them by employment applications. These were usually then made up in a form suitable for carrying in the wallet, ready for use when needed.

EVALUATION OF THE E AND D EXPERIENCE

How is one to evaluate counseling in the E and D projects? Vocational counseling per se is not likely to change the life of a counselee. In a recent, and as yet unpublished, international study sponsored by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, special youth counselors were attached to employment service offices in each of several countries, including the U.S. The final data show no difference in placement rate or job tenure among youths who were handled by the counselor, and those in the control group who received the services of the employment office without counseling. The research did suggest however, that much depends upon the relationship between worker supply and demand. That is, much depends upon the context in which counseling took place (although this conclusion could not be empirically verified due to the small samples involved and the loose control over the relevant variables). The importance of context is probably as it should be. For counseling includes processes for helping people make and implement choices; it must, therefore, be dependent on the availability of choice.

The Context of Counseling: Training and Placement

Indeed, one may begin by citing as the major achievement of the E and D projects, and one whose recognition may have far-reaching effects in the structure of training for vocational counseling, the demonstration of the principle that counseling should be a part of a comprehensive program which includes more than counseling. The one feature shared by all E and D projects was counseling as a part of a larger set of services, including training and placement. In no project did counseling stand by itself, as simply an office in which a youth could be tested, could discuss his vocational goals and wishes, could talk about whatever hangups were blocking him from the realization of his goals, and from which he could then be sent away to do whatever he wanted to about the conclusions he had reached. JOY reports that the greatest dropout rate (69 percent) and smallest rate of employment (17 percent) were among those who received only counseling. Counseling plus another service (usually training) was most effective (35 percent dropped out and 65 percent got employment). Those who received some service but not counseling had a 43 percent dropout rate and 33 percent got jobs.

All this experience, with counseling as one resource among several designed to improve employability, does lead to another important conclusion, which also constitutes a criticism of counseling in the E and D programs. Despite its embeddedness, the importance of the conseling context was grossly underestimated. As a first and, perhaps, too broad generalization, one might say that the more that counseling in an E and D project had to replace training and placement, rather than supplement training and placement, the poorer the program, the poorer the counseling, and the less the project was able to demonstrate or discover anything about counseling methods for disadvantaged youths. The more that counseling was a substitute for a chance to learn a work role by working under guidance, the more it substituted guidance about acting like a worker for training in actually performing work skills, the more it tried to replace the incentives of good jobs with psychological assaults on motives and attitudes, the poorer the program. The more it tried to teach role skills in the absence of a role to be played, the more difficult its task. One could almost say, the more the program depended on counseling, the poorer it was, or, the less the counseling stood as an activity in its own right, the better was the counseling. The more counseling stood alone rather than acted as a counterpoint to the youth's training and work experience, the greater was its failure.

Many of the things done in the name of counseling were good. Many activities, tours, and site visits to familiarize the youths with the world of work and the transportation systems of their city; interviews with employers; practice in filling out applications for employment; explanations of paycheck deductions, social security, and income tax withholding; and role-playing interviews; recognize needs of disadvantaged youths heretofore unnoticed. But when these things become the entire counseling program, except for counseling individuals about interests and aptitudes which the project cannot gratify through appropriate job placements, the more that these things much be done independently of the worker role, the harder they are to do and the more time they take. When counseling is not embedded in job training and work, it must deal with vague, ambiguous, and impalpable attitudes with a connection with actual work performance that must be left to inference. When counseling is part of work and training it can deal with the hard realities of behavior and can limit itself to those which play a part in the youths' worklives.

Training

The basic supposition of E and D programs, repeatedly stressed in this report, is that youth unemployment is a product of deficiencies in the youths themselves. The goals of counseling in E and D programs consisted of efforts to correct these deficiencies, and to help make the youths amenable to corrective action through training.

The problem of making the youths amenable to training was complicated by what this writer believes was an almost uniform misdiagnosis. In the effort to invest heavily in counseling resources, too little attention was paid to the nature of incentive. Job development and placement were skimped. A spiralling process occurred: absence of incentive was interpreted as lack of motivation; this diagnosis led to training programs more concerned with the attitudinal and motivational components of the work role than with intrinsic job skills, the training thus did not lead to or prepare youths for incentive jobs so they responded to the training with apathy, reinforcing the diagnosis of low motivation and leading to the expansion of pre-vocational counseling and training on the assumption that the youths were not yet "ready" for solid technical training in work skills. The end point of this development was that many programs approximated one project's position, which could be described as a program for getting youths ready to get ready through low-level training for ill-paying or non-existent jobs. Under such circumstances, the ultimate goals are so far removed from a youth's hopes when he enters the program, so uncertain, and so tenuously related to the project's program, that they cannot function as incentives. This further reinforces the diagnosis of inadequate motivation and creates the problem of counseling. It becomes necessary to produce attitude changes and motivation in the absence of work incentives sufficiently powerful to create work behavior in the youths. In this sense, counseling attempts to operate as a substitute for jobs, or training recognizable as preparing youths for worthwhile jobs; and counseling is used to hold youths in programs until MDTA courses and on-the-job training placements can be arranged.

This portrait is overdrawn, to be sure. It would be unrealistic to expect that disadvantaged youths would have no problems remaining in lengthy and difficult training courses, provided only that the courses were obvious and certain preparation for worthwhile jobs. Few have the financial recources for such training, and many are too inexperienced in the world of work to be able to recognize the relevance of such training. For such youths, placement in part-time or short-term jobs coordinated with counseling about training and future career planning is feasible; but only provided that the youth and the agency clearly recognize that such placements are temporary, that they form the context for counseling rather than the end of it, and that better and larger pay-offs are or will be made available. Few projects have been able to sustain such a commitment.

If it is difficult for disadvantaged youths to stay with lengthy and difficult training in high-level-skill jobs, how much more difficult it is for them to stay in courses equally difficult (though, perhaps, not in an intellectual sense) but patently not likely to lead to worthwhile jobs. Here counseling has had to function as a substitute for good training. It appears that MDTA training for disadvantaged youths has been inappropriate, rigid, loaded with irrelevancies, overly academic, conducted in a schoolmarmish manner, and seldom directed a good skilled trades; one need only compare them with the carefully programmed instruction in good trades which characterized YMCA and Draper, to note the differences.

Counselors were overeager to enter the fray. Their deep commitment to the antipoverty program, their awareness of the injustices which had left disadvantaged youths totally without counseling attention, made them anxious to redress the balance. Anxious to be helpful and needed, many counselors overestimated the youths' need for close emotional and psychological support and underestimated the capacity of the youths to respond to real incentives, thus overemphasizing the job deficiencies of the youths and underemphasizing the role of incentive and opportunity. In attempts to motivate the youths, they counseled in terms of the interests and aptitudes of the youths, without recognizing how little the jobs available had to do with interests and aptitudes.

These problems were often increased by the structural and administrative features of E and D projects, when the projects had little or no control over the character of the MDTA training available, or the scheduling of such training; when on-the-job training arrangements turned out to be almost impossible to make; when projects were rushed into operation before they had any placement or training opportunities available; when project fundings were unconscionably delayed; and when the pay and allowances were rarely received on time. These problems fed the E and D projects greatest weakness, they made the ultimate incentive of a good job at good pay even more unbelievable to the project youths, and destroyed whatever credibility the agency had as one with the power, influence, and resources to make good its promise. A minor example may illustrate the difficulty. One report noted that counselors found the youths extremely hostile and suspicious. Such hostility and suspiciousness is said to be a characteristic of disadvantaged youths which interferes with their employability; it is therefore a proper focus for change efforts. Yet, because of administrative tie-ups, the youths had not received the promised pay and allowances, and the promised paid work-training had not materialized. In effect, the project had created the problem it was trying to cure.

Once projects were in operation and face to face with the lack of training and placement resources, there was little that they could do but counsel. Project efforts were directed into holding operations; doing things because they were good (e.g., cultural enrichment programs); providing experiences and guidance for such peripheral matters as filling out applications, taking interviews, acting middle class, having good realtionships with others, being cooperative, etc.; and using ingenious formats to make such activities appear realistic--in the absence of the only thing that could make them real--a skilled youth able to apply for a good job for which he is technically qualified.

The lack of attention to work incentives constitutes the most significant failure of the E and D projects. Proposals appear to have been funded primarily on the basis of the attractiveness of their techniques, with little attention paid to the availability of placements.

One of the things to be learned from the E and D programs is that the present structure of MDTA training is inadequate. The complex machinery for establishing and conducting such training is so unwieldy and lacking in a focus for responsibility, influence, and control, that it cannot serve the training needs of the nation's disadvantaged youths. The utility of counseling and assessment depend greatly on the contexts in which they work and the uses to which they are put. They cannot be expected to substitute for training and/or for the jobs to which adequate training can lead. Their feasibility in a program in which training and placement are completely inadequate cannot be established.

Much of the need for E and D projects arises from a persistent failure in the structure of American education to reconcile adequately its principles of open access to schooling at all levels (which implies a resistence to early specialization that would block the individual from reversing or altering his track and his educational objectives) and the need of individuals for vocational training. As presently organized, local school systems may not and cannot provide competent technical training in skilled trades, except perhaps in the largest and most affluent cities. The demands of technology are such that machines become quickly outdated. While the constant replacement and improvement of the tools of production is economically feasible in industry, no school board can hope to have the financial resources to do so. Inevitably, vocational training in the schools must use methods, equipment, and procedures which are always outdated.

This hiatus in education has usually been filled by industry through vocational training sponsored by employers and by labor organizations. Both of these have ceased to fill the gap created by the absence of technical vocational education in the public school system. They function so that disadvantaged minority group members have the least access to the training.

The MDTA program was an attempt to improve the supply of vocational training in a way which would least disturb the organization of education in the country, and least interfere with the principle of local control of the schools. This has resulted in an administrative arrangement so cumbersome and inefficient that it cannot do the job. It has not altered the problem of training youths in the use of modern techniques and tools required by industry; it has not been able to prevent the intrusion of academic requirements and forms bearing no relation to the needs of the work (i. e., MDTA training continues to require more knowledge of mathematics, physics, and mechanics than is really needed to learn the trade, and more abstractions and theory than job performance requires); and it has not been able to offer a range and variety of courses when they are needed and where they are needed.

The resistance, by state and local authorities, to the E and D projects, their refusal to adapt their training to the needs of the youths, and their inability to solve the problems of personnel (e. g., getting good craftsmen to teach, and giving them the status, security, and salary needed to keep them) has demonstrated the inability of the educational system to take advantage of the opportunity in the legislation for developing new programs and emphases. A defensive concern about maintaining independence and control has taken precedence over attempts to solve the problems of the disadvantaged youths.

It appears that the U.S. Department of Labor must abandon its attempt to work through the present educational system as its major resource for providing vocational training, and should seek to institutionalize other resources for providing skill training in a way that will make training more responsive to the needs of the labor market and the potential workers. In short, technical training should no longer remain the province of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It should be placed squarely in the Department of Labor, which should then look to labor and industry or perhaps even to a federally-sponsored new national institution, to provide for employment training.

However, the Department of Labor should free itself from its implicit agreement with organized labor to refrain from sponsoring training in apprenticeable trades. It must be frankly stated that protective union policies have resulted in the denial of access to the very types of training which disadvantaged youths need most and are best able to respond to. It is recommended that the Department of Labor seek legislation which would either give the Department some kind of monitoring control over the provision of apprenticeship training, or which would guarantee to the public equal access to such training (e. g., the preference for the children of union members should be no more binding that would preferences by schools for the children of schoolteachers).

A decision to put the needs of the unemployed at least as high in the order of priority as the needs of organized labor could go far in freeing on-the-job training programs from the administrative tangles which have made them even more limited in their utility as training resources for disadvantaged youths than MDTA courses. Increased efficiency in arranging for on-the-job training placements, together with legislation which would increase industry's incentive to train and hire the unemployed (e. g., through the reduction of payroll taxes as a function of the number of people trained and hired by a company), would expand the role of industry in providing vocational training.

In contrast to the present policy of MDTA (that candidates must be qualified for training), the Department of Labor should operate on the policy that the training must be made appropriate to the status of the trainee. A policy of open access to vocational training, similar to the policy of E and D projects trying to find something for everyone rather than selectively admitting to the program, should be substituted for the present policy. Under these conditions counseling would be better able to assume an appropriate role, and help individuals to make choices in terms of their interests, abilities, and characteristics.

One of the most important ideas to emerge was the emphasis placed on the role of counseling in the context of training. The techniques for *in situ* counseling were among the most important innovations in counseling in E and D projects. The introduction of information and guidance about such matters as job search techniques, and job interview behavior as these matters become relevant to the youth, require a context of job-skill training in which the counselor participates as observer and guide. Such a counseling setting makes the role of the counselor one who helps identify and interpret for the youth the changes in his skills and behavior. The youths' own experiences in trying to learn valued and valuable job skills, leading to good technical jobs, provide the best motivation for undertaking reading and arithmetic upgrading and the opportunity for instruction in basic education most clearly appropriate to occupational needs.

Placement

The placement context, as well as the training context, must be examined for an evaluation of counseling in the E and D programs. It must be kept in mind that placement figures may be treated as evidence, but should not be treated as criteria. E and D projects were admirable in their resistence to playing the numbers game despite the pressures to be successful, in order to avoid the well-known pattern of looking good by working only with the most placeable.

The placement figures of projects covered in this report were by and large so discouraging as to provide little justification for the programs. Each citation is from a different project.

Of 422 referrals, 346 were accepted into the project. Of these, 160 cases were closed by the time of reporting; of those 160, only 38 had jobs.

Project dropouts were employed at the same rate as completers. Of those followed up, only 29 had jobs, while 37 were still seeking employment.

Sixty-two percent of the project graduates fulfilled project aims by relocating after training, but half of those returned home again shortly thereafter. Others can be expected to return home at a somewhat slower rate.

One hundred and thirteen out of 174 women completed the program, of which only 55 found jobs (half of those by their own efforts), few of which were in the areas for which they were trained.

One hundred and seventy were referred; only ten came out the other end with jobs.

Forty percent dropped the project before placement could be arranged.

Of 454 youths served, 145 were placed. Only 12 were in MDTA training or OJT.

Fifty-two percent of the youths left the project for "negative" reasons. Forty percent of the placements were in laboring jobs. Out of 720 youths taken into the project, only 165 got jobs through the project, and 124 got jobs on their own.

Only 25 percent of project youths were placed.

The project had a placement rate of 28 percent.

Of 1, 311 "served" by the project, 200 were placed on jobs.

Over 40 percent dropped from the project. Placement rate was 25 percent.

Placement rate ran at 24 percent.

Only 28 percent found jobs through the project; an equal number found jobs on their own. It is not known how long these jobs lasted.

Between 30 percent and 50 percent of project youth can be expected to drop out of the project. Placement rates will hover about 25 percent. Those who stay with the projects will not get jobs at a higher rate than those who drop out. The majority of jobs will be of the same type that disadvantaged youths have always been able to get. This dismal picture is not intended to reflect on counseling per se--dropouts and placement rates are figures too gross to permit a pinpointing of the part of the program that is responsible. It does indicate that the promise of a good job could not operate as an incentive, and that this resource was closed to counselors. Counseling, as an activity, cannot be expected to replace the function of incentives.

This placement picture can be contrasted with other statistics.

There was no delinquency recidivism during training. Sixty-seven percent were employed after training, 42 percent in the area for which trained. Seventy percent had the same jobs three months later (YMCA).

Seventy percent of the placements were successful on follow-up, although the only individual counseling of the trainees took place after placement (except for a handful who requested counseling for personal problems). Recidivism rate was well under the national average (Draper).

Placement rates in five other projects also seemed to run better than average: the Skills Center, Philadelphia JEVS, St. Louis JEVS, Kansas City JEVS, and Springfield Goodwill. The important thing to note about all of these projects is that, in them, counseling was embedded in a program of good skill training, good placement, and follow-up efforts. It seems to be a case of success breeding success for, with such positive results, the counseling is aided by the increased confidence the youths have of obtaining the incentive.

There are, of course, difficulties in evaluating the placement statistics. Projects did not use any uniform system for counting and recording placements and bookkeeping seems to have been so disorganized, in some, that the figures are probably unreliable. More important, no project used a control group to provide a base rate of job-getting and job-holding by non-project youths in the same city and operating under the same labor-market conditions.

The failure of OMAT to require projects to obtain such base rates is simply astounding.

Associated with the generally poor development of placement as an E and D project function was the lack of development of placement counseling. At first glance it would appear that the placement function provides the opportunity for effective, immediate, and realistic counseling with maximum impact on the client. Thus placement as such (i. e. , not including job development) should be handled by counseling personnel. However, in most projects it was handled by placement people of unknown training and background, whose emphasis appeared to be more on the placement administration than on use of the situation as a frame for counseling. As this is the usual organization of counseling and placement resources, institutionalized in the employment services, the use of placement as a counseling resource and the occasion for counseling must count as an important innovation in such projects as Philadelphia JEVS, Kansas City JEVS, YMCA, Draper, and to some extent, PAL. One recommendation, growing out of this experience, is that the Employment Service rethink its role structuring and organization of services to separate placement counseling from job development. To assign the placement counseling to the counseling staff not as an end in itself, but as a major vehicle for the beginning of counseling. The bulk of counseling may well follow placement, as part of follow-up, rather than precede it. A great expansion in other activities for job development personnel might be envisioned which would more than replace their counseling functions.

One consequence of the organization of counseling as a pre-placement activity is the compartmentalization and serialization of staff services, and conflict among the parts. That is, counseling came before placement, making it logical for many projects to have a counseling staff which operates separately from a job development-placement staff. In a context in which training is largely directed at the superficial characteristics of the work role, rather than at the work-role itself (i.e., at comportment, promptness, dress, etc., rather than at the skills needed to perform the work) placement people had no tangible basis on which to sell a youth to an employer. While it is true that employers want their workers to look and act nicely, their primary concern is with the worker's ability to do the job. Lacking such a basis for offering a youth to an employer, the placement people were in a necessarily difficult position. Counseling staff, on the other hand, unable to do anything about skill training and having done all it could so far as motivation and attitude counseling were concerned, were naturally anxious to see the youth get a job. The result was friction between the two parts of the staff in many projects. This problem could be greatly mitigated by making placements the occasion for counseling.

Aside from the well-established sheltered workshop format (one in which features of both training and placement are combined in a manner which makes possible the in situ and immediate counseling which this report has emphasized), the E and D projects produced two other formats of great potential importance as contexts for counseling. These two formats are the worker's cooperative, such as Neighborhood House's Supreme Services, and the Job Bank, which became a feature of St. Louis JEVS when it accepted a contract to train a group of youths for positions as photo-finishers for a photo processing company.

Both of these formats allow the project to guarantee a job to a youth in advance, thus forming a powerful and certain incentive as a support for counseling. They both permit maximum tailoring of training to the needs of the job, thus obviating the suspicion that the things they are required to learn really represent ways of giving the trainees academic schooling when they are not looking. Both formats also obviate the need for extensive instruction and counseling in job search techniques, interview behavior, and the like. Both represent a guarantee to the youths that the project can deliver the goods, and both permit the youths to learn the work role by actually playing the work role, combined with training under supervision.

Both ideas could well become institutionalized in employment service functions. The Job Bank is probably easier to use as the employment services are presently structured. To adapt the idea, an employment service counselor could contact companies that have placed orders and encourage them to make a temporary commitment of the job to a particular youth, and not to fill the job until the youth has been able to take the necessary training. The challenge to job developers would be to persuade the employers to list such orders sufficiently in advance of need to provide time for training. Once such a commitment has been obtained from an employer, the counselor can use that job as an incentive for the youth with whom he is working, making the incentive even more concrete by such techniques as having the youth visit the future place of employment, see others working in the same job, etc.

The use of workers' cooperatives would be more difficult to arrange without some important expansions in the role and function of employment services. The Department of Labor would do well to study ways in which it might make local offices capable of sponsoring, organizing, and supervising such cooperatives, which might then either be spun off as entirely independent companies operating in the open market and providing employment for their members, or which might continue to serve as financially independent on-the-job training resources from which workers can be placed in private industries of the same type. In the latter case, such cooperatives could operate as a mid-station between sheltered workshop and regular placement in local industry. In either case, the amount of subsidization required seems likely to be much less than that involved in MDTA pay and allowances, inasmuch as a key feature of the co-op is that it actually performs work which is sold to the public at its market value. In this respect, such co-ops are not different from the traditional sheltered workshop.

Providing services to the public at market value is an important component for both sheltered workshops and workers' co-ops. Although the reasons for it are not entirely clear, it seems apparent that the need to earn money insures that the work-training which takes place within them will approximate true work roles as found in private industry, so that the training will be more realistic and appropriate. This realism has been lacking in such work-training programs as

Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, and placements for work training in government offices, as tried by some E and D projects. This lack, more than any other, has rendered such work training largely ineffective, except as a socially acceptable device for getting some money to poor youths. All too often, youths are learning not to work, but to look busy. The facts of production, with profit-sharing, become almost unmatchable sources of pride and motivation, especially when these are seen as reliably leading to respected work as independent wage-earning adults.

Government could provide further help for such co-ops, and for sheltered workshops, by providing either incentives for government contractors to subcontract to such agencies, or by establishing a policy that government contractors must subcontract to such agencies when it can be shown that such agencies can perform the required services at a level of quality and cost not inferior to that of other potential subcontractors who do not function as work-training agencies.

Such possibilities bespeak larger roles for job developers. One of the great handicaps of the E and D projects was a lack of people with knowledge and expertise, in or out of the employment services, regarding job development methods. Reliance on the public spirit of employers is not enough. The provision of a follow-up counseling "package" to employers seems to have been welcomed by them (Springfield Goodwill, MFY, Kansas City JEVS). Thus job developers could well make use of counseling as a device for encouraging hiring. Other techniques of job development were not utilized (such as job fractionalization) although such techniques bear heavily on the counseling and training aspects of the projects. These considerations underscore the need for the Department of Labor to shift its emphasis in the near future from its almost exclusive concern with counseling, to a concern with counseling in the context of training and placement. The Department must take steps not only to expand access to vocational training, but also take leadership in the development and codification of a body of knowledge and techniques for job development that would move this most important function beyond its current, almost primitive, state. The removal of placement counseling responsibilities from job placement personnel would help to free them for the use of such techniques.

Reference has been made to restrictive union practices regarding internship training. It is also necessary to cite union restructions on hiring. The experience of the PEPSY project is illuminating; a letter from the union council strongly supporting the project is included in the project's report. In that letter, the effectiveness of the partnership between unions and the project in the urban renewal program, in which union foremen and master craftsmen provided pre-apprenticeship training for the project youth, is extolled. The letter goes on to cite the important training gains made by the youths, the quality of their work, etc. But the letter ends with the hope that PEPSY will expand its program to include youths with high-school educations who meet the standards of the union, so that these youths might be used to help relieve the shortage of skilled union labor in the area. In short, despite enthusiasm for the PEPSY program, and despite its positive experiences in that program, there was no evidence that the union would relax its restrictive (and discriminatory) policies regarding employment. It is time for the Department of Labor to take steps to end such discriminatory practices. Recognizing that the problems are different in many ways, it is nevertheless clear that the Department of Labor has not been as assiduous in ending segregation in labor as the Department of HEW has been with reference to schools and hospitals.

Another problem also hampered the placement process. Juvenile records kept many youths from jobs, particularly federal jobs (especially those for which employees may be hired on the spot, which comprise the bulk of the civil service employments that disadvantaged youths are likely to get). This presents the paradox of the U.S. Government spending several millions of dollars on E and D projects in an effort to make disadvantaged youths more accpetable as employees to private employers while it remains obdurate in excluding them from its own employment. The Department of Labor should press forward to achieve the elimination of such barriers to civil service jobs and to entrance in the Armed Forces.

MISCELLANEOUS

Group Methods

The great expansion of group counseling methods in the E and D projects was one of their most important achievements. A great deal of experience has been gained and counselors today are both more skillful and more receptive to group methods as a result. The single-minded restriction to the individual one-to-one relationship has been replaced by an appreciation of the roles of both kinds of counseling.

There may be a paradox, however, in the manner in which group counseling was done in many E and D projects. The most typical professional resistance to group methods has been based on the idea that the skills required for counseling a group must exceed those required for individual counseling. This group feels that instead of being sensitive to the meanings of one client, the group counselor must be sensitive to several at once; that instead of concentrating on the relationship between himself and the client, he must attend to the inter-relationships among many; and instead of designing his remarks to fit the needs of one client, his responses must be uniquely appropriate for all. Thus the problem of group counseling is the problem of individual counsel ing raised by a factor equal to the number of people in the group.

The paradox of this position is that many counselors feel untrained, inexperienced, and reluctant to use group methods, forcing projects spontaneously to turn to nonprofessionals to run their groups, while the professionals restrict themselves to individual counseling. Here is one example of the consequences of a profession's failure to meet the needs of society. The society turns to others. It would be unfortunate if the general absence of professionals from the group methods used in the E and D projects should serve to continue to exclude such methods from the repertoire of the professional. It would be helpful as a further stimulus to the profession if the Employment Service would take advantage of the experiences of the E and D projects in the use of group methods. It has been dragging its feet on the matter out of an apparent, but misguided, allegiance to individual counseling as the "highest" type of professional conduct and service.

None of the E and D experience supports such a role for individual counseling.

Subprofessionals

The value and usefulness of subprofessionals, in working with disadvantaged youths,has been one of the outstanding demonstrations of the E and D program. The products of that demonstration have already been represented in such programs as Project CAUSE and VISTA. Despite the absence of definitive research on the matter, the experiences of E and D projects in this regard have been so uniformly positive as to lend great weight to the idea that subprofessionals, particularly those drawn from the same culture as the target population, can perform the most useful services in programs for disadvantaged youths and, under professional support and supervision, can carry out much of the direct contact services required.

There is also a danger to be avoided. In only one of the E and D projects (YMCA) was care taken to protect the supervisory function from being inundated by service demands. The danger is, that with the short funding characteristic of E and D projects and the emphasis in Washington on the number of youths served, the pressures on a project will almost always operate to make supervision one of the first casualties. In the absence of a good supervisory program, projects may restrict their subprofessionals to those areas where they can do least harm on their own; the result will be a failure to use the full talents and resources of the subprofessionals.

In any case, there is no evidence presented in any of the E and D projects that those tasks performed by subprofessionals would have been or were better performed by professionals, except in those cases where the subprofessional was employed in a clearly professional role for which he was simply poorly qualified.

Interventionism

Another major achievement of the E and D programs was the institutionalization of an interventionist stance, in which the willingness of counselors to enter directly into all facets of a youth's life, and to take a hand in helping to solve problems between the youths and many different parts of his social environment, was most apparent. This willingness may not only have helped many youths over particular problems which might otherwise have blocked their growth toward employment; it had a side benefit whose importance would be difficult to demonstrate empirically, but which nevertheless seems to be there. That benefit lies in the implicit communication from the counselor to the youth that the counselor cares enough about the youth to take unusual actions, to step out of his passive role, to devote himself to problems whose contexts are outside the counseling office and even outside the center. Thus the counselor communicates that his friendship and support of the youth goes beyond that strictly required by the counselor's role. Such unusual demonstrations of commitment may be required to overcome the typical suspiciousness and anomie of disadvantaged youths. It also means that counselors will learn more and more of the conditions of life of disadvantaged youths, instead of remaining isolated from that life by the walls of their offices. Such exposure is likely to operate as a continuing motivation to keep counseling more relevant to the needs of this population.

Follow-Up

The absence of an adequate follow-up program in most projects marks a conspicuous failure in the E and D program. A failure not only of the projects, but of OMAT's ability to supervise its contract recipients to ensure that grantees provided the programs they had promised and for which they contracted. The ease with which so many projects relinquished their follow-up commitments under the pressure of service needs indicates that follow-up is generally not perceived as central to the core of counseling. The experiences of the E and D projects, however, lead to the conclusion that follow-up may provide the opportunity for the most effective and strategic counseling, not only in encouraging job tenure, but also for career development, job-upgrading, and for helping youths to see the need for training. The concreteness and relevance of follow-up counseling also highly recommend it.

Counseling in Residential Programs

Only two projects realized their intention to embed counseling into a total living experience for their youths (NMU and Pinellas County) and one found that the residence situation itself produced new stresses and problems for the youths of such magnitude as to be as difficult as the problems which residence was supposed to solve. Residential programs are likely to involve counselors in more problems than those which are strictly relevant to the vocational needs of the youths, and these other problems become so imperious that the total effect can be to result in less vocational counseling. It is therefore recommended that residential programs be funded only under unusual circumstances, such as a radically new technology (e. g., CASE II of the National Training School), or in the absence of any other possible way of reaching and working with a highly decentralized population of rural youths.

Supervision and Staff Leadership

With the emphasis on counseling in the programs, there was a natural tendency for counseling personnel to play large, and in many cases, determining roles in the design of project services and activities. In several projects counselors devoted more of their efforts to program planning and administration than they did to actual counseling interchanges with the youths. Unfortunately, program planning and administration has seldom been a formal part of the training of counselors, and the result of this lack of training and experience was often a chaotic administration which seemed almost always to be responding to some crisis. One project even found it necessary to close down operations for a while so that it could pay some considered attention to its course. The project administrative staff was tied up in endless negotiations with educational authorities, with employment service representatives, with OMAT and BAT, and with all the inconvenience and time and money lost in waiting for and having to discard worthless GSA equipment. Yet the project nevertheless needed to appear successful enough, both in terms of the numbers served and the absence of embarrassing incident that might arouse any public criticism of the project, to ensure another year's continuation of the grant. The pressures were obviously too much for the staff, already trimmed to the bone by false economy,[5] to give adequate supervision and leadership

[5] Recent research shows that sheltered workshops with large administrative superstructures actually produced more goods and services relative to costs than did those with small administrative staffs.

to their cadres. The general lack of in-service training and even of time for communication among staff members, was almost uniform among the projects.

Effects on Youths of E and D Funding Patterns

The last evaluative comment refers to observations made in two programs, ABCD and Lane County, and developments which the reader could sense in several others (e.g., Pinellas County). In these projects, the uncertainties and anxieties about contract renewal and attendant upon the phasing out of a program which was not to be renewed, had a discernably negative effect on the youths, who tended to respond with increasing acting out, loss of trust and confidence in the project, and resistance to counseling. This loss of effectiveness added further worries to the project staff who then feared that the acting out and other behavior of the youths would further reduce the project's chance of being funded again. Thus the staff would become even more anxious, stimulating further acting out and anxiety in the youths in a vicious spiral. This is a further negative consequence of the short-term funding pattern which has been criticized elsewhere in this report. If, despite recommendations to the contrary, the present structure of E and D funding is to continue, OMPER should develop with the projects some definite guidelines for phasing them out. These might include not funding projects which rely exclusively on OMPER for their funds, OMPER participation in locating other sources of funds for continuing the program, operation of projects for defined experimental periods after which project services and staff are taken over lock, stock, and barrel, as operating units, by the state employment services, and/or, as a last resort, adequate planning and scheduling of funds so that no project is faced with last-minute cliff-hanging acts about additional funding. OMPER might consider requiring, as a part of the contract, a complete plan and timetable for project phasing out. OMPER would have to make sure such plans were followed in order to avoid being in the position of being a producer of problems for disadvantaged youths rather than the solver of problems. When OMPER undertakes to fund a project for the youths in a community, that undertaking involves a commitment to the youths which cannot be simply forgotten when the project timetable expires. OMPER must accept the responsibility for weakening as much as possible the negative consequences to the youths in phasing out a project in which the youths had seen a last hope for themselves, and the only indication that the nation cares about them.

As was indicated earlier, E and D projects resisted the temptation to achieve good placement records by dealing only with the most able youths. As the fervor of the poverty program wanes, however, this resistance may weaken even before it gains much strength, in such organizations as the employment service. It is therefore recommended that the Department of Labor insure against such an eventuality by redesigning the basis on which it funds employment services and E and D projects. A basis for funding could be developed so that the larger the proportion of the case load consisting of disadvantaged poeple (as measured objectively by such devices as used by the Job Corps in screening applicants), the more money per case is granted. It would thus be in the agency's interest to give priority to the disadvantaged, the aging, and the handicapped.

170/171

III
Supportive Services

Given the definition of counseling and its role which emerges from the preceding sections, it is apparent that many activities, which in other contexts are classed as supportive services, are here considered as aspects of counseling as a behavioral change process.

In some cases, the so-called supportive services (e.g., residential experience) provided the settings within which counseling was done. In other cases, such techniques as presenting role models of successful minority group members, or providing opportunities for exploration of the world of work, were the vehicles through which agencies attempted to reach counseling goals.

Some supportive services were necessary to permit counseling to occur at all (e.g., legal services, health care). Some so-called supportive services were varieties of intervention which functioned as kinds of counseling in their own right, and equally important, served as techniques with which the agency demonstrated its commitment to the youths (e.g., family intervention, psychotherapy, cultural enrichment, recreation, financial and legal assistance). Indeed, the breakdown of the distinction between counseling (considered as an office activity engaged in through verbal interchange between a counselor and one or more clients) and other activities which contribute to, replace, or enhance counseling effectiveness is one of the major features of the E and D program, and one of its most important achievements.

Under these circumstances it is apparent that many activities traditionally known as supportive services have been dealt with in this report as aspects of counseling and counseling programs (e.g., casework, family intervention, etc.). Thus, all that remain to be discussed are a few services not covered elsewhere and the description of some needs which emerged from project experience.

SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES

Residential Facilities

Residential facilities were provided for three different purposes: to solve the problem of rural geography; correctionally; and to provide for homeless or marginally-housed clients.

Two projects involved voluntary residence by youths away from home in project-provided facilities (Pinellas County, NMU). A third project had intended to provide a dormitory unit, but through administrative error, the facility did not develop.

In all three cases, the provision of housing was designed to be a solution to the problem of working with a population too thinly distributed over rural areas to support agency centers close to the homes of the youths. In the case of NMU, the residential facilities on a campus were simple extensions of the usual university pattern of providing housing and food service for its students, whereas Pinellas County used the residence as a framework for counseling and other services designed to change the behavior of the youths. Pinellas County discovered that, in fact, many of its youths came to the project to leave their homes and home communities, rather than from a desire for job training; few of these youths returned home after the program. Although Pinellas County reports sound rather annoyed about this, the value of such a program in encouraging rural youth to migrate to urban centers should be noted. This finding makes it especially regrettable that another project, whose aim was the urbanization of rural Appalachian youth, did not realize its intention to provide residential experience. Without such experience, the youths did not in fact migrate to urban job centers, and on that score the project was a notable failure.

NMU's program also was designed to encourage migration out of the area and was similarly unsuccessful. Its contrast to the unintended success of Pinellas County may be a product of the difference between university and nonuniversity sponsorship and facilities, or of cultural differences between Florida and Northern Michigan.

Both Northern Michigan and Pinellas County were in the ironic position of providing residential services to provide rural youths with access to services, and then finding that some of the youths were denied project services because they could not successfully live in dormitories. Both projects found that the residential experience created its own problems requiring attention to aspects of clients' lives with which agencies are not normally concerned (e.g., keeping living quarters neat and orderly, conformity to agency definitions of its prerogatives and responsibilities under the locus parentis relationship, etc.). Such attention provided the agencies with opportunities to extend their counseling to asepcts of the youths' lives which otherwise do not enter into the world of the local agency; but, at the same time, the projects invaded areas rather far removed from questions of employability and concerned themselves with behavior which is otherwise not within the mandate of government or quasi-official administration. The presence of a large group of disadvantaged youths in a semi-public facility founded on middle-class norms is highly visible, and the agencies found that they had to take measures to defend themselves from public criticism. Sometimes these measures represented a requirement that the youths conform to middle-class behavioral standards in areas removed from questions of employability; sometimes the measures meant the removal of a youth from the training program, thus defeating the program's primary mission of providing accessibility to employability-developing programs. In either case, the agencies had to devote a great deal of counselor time to resolving inter-and intra-group conflicts, thus decreasing the time they were available for more vocationally relevant counseling.

The residence, as a solution to the problems of rural geography, poses its own problems and the latter set of problems may be greater than those for which the residential program was designed. The Michigan program came to this conclusion and has indicated that it will no longer base its training around on-campus residence. It seems likely that for programs which do not aim at relocation of trainees, mobile teams, no matter how costly and inefficient, may prove less costly and more effective than residence as a solution to the problem of geography.

However, where relocation is desired, an urban-based residential program may be of value.

Several projects provided housing for some of their youths. JOBS made arrangements for a small residential unit at a YMCA for those youths who either lacked homes or whose homes were so disorganized that they needed to move out. The Wise County project located rooms for trainees without homes. Four other projects (Detroit, CPI, Lorton, ABCD) cite the need to locate or provide living accomodations for some youths: ABCD stated it as a need for a halfway house. In addition, Philadelphia JEVS noted that several youths had expressed the desire to leave their neighborhood gangs but could not do so unless they left the neighborhood. Had the project been able to provide living accomodations, some youths might in fact have broken away from their gangs. Draper concluded that the location of the housing found for parolees was an important factor in determining the parolee's recreations and friendships, and his resistance to returning to crime.

It should be noted in the above that those projects which did offer housing services for homeless youths did so informally and in a manner which maintained the privacy of residence, rather than collectivizing the process through project-operated dormitories. These projects apparently did not find such housing arrangements difficult, although they were not able to use the residence units as a base for counseling, as in NMU and Pinellas County.

It appears that there is a need for projects to provide some kinds of residential facilities, but that these facilities can be provided without the project putting itself in loco parentis. Finding rooms for youths appears to be a better course than formalized residential institutions.

Two other projects involved residential experience, but in these cases it was non-voluntary in that the projects were located in correctional institutions. These projects could exercise much greater control over the behavior of the youths in residence. However, only one of these projects (Draper) was able to use its control effectively, the other program having so little organizational and programmatic coherence that it could not use the opportunities inherent in its situation.

Even in the case of Draper the prison experiences of the youths, outside the training program, were only minimally used in support of the project's goals. Information about the youths' behavior outside the project was gathered and later used to confront the youths in order to break through the roles they had adopted vis-a-vis the project. However, other vocationally-oriented use of the prison environment was lacking, such as the kind of programming of all aspects of life which was achieved at CASE II at the National Training School for Boys.

The control aspects of the prison environment meant that the projects were not subjected to the problems with which voluntary residential programs had to deal. The fact of incarceration provided legal sanction for the exercise of control and influence over aspects of youths' lives with which federally-financed voluntary programs may be ethically restricted from using. There is irony in the observation that those projects which had the opportunity and right to manipulate the total life spaces of their youths did not use the opportunity, while those with less justification and less opportunity made the attempt.

YOB recommends that institutional arrangements be made for those youths who are brain-damaged, mentally defective, addicted, or otherwise incapable of minimal regulation of their behavior. YOB found these youths so disruptive that they could not be served in YOB's program. Short of imprisonment or a Synanon-type program, however such youths would probably be even more destructive of a residential program.

Loans and Financial Support

The single most frequently mentioned need was for funds to be used for small loans to project youth. Detroit, Des Moines, YOB, Temple, NCCY, JOBS, Lorton, and VAS-Altro all mentioned the need for cash loans to the youths, while two other projects (YMCA and KEY) indicated that MDTA allowances were not sufficient for the needs of the youths. Des Moines found that 75 per cent of the youths needed loans at one time or another, at an average of $20 per youth. These loans were needed to tide the youth over the long delay before MDTA allowances arrived; and to provide them with carfare to the project, to job interviews, and to work during the first week of employment before a paycheck was received. JOBS used its loan fund: to help youths pay bills; catch up on back rent; to pay for babysitting; to buy needed clothing, uniforms for work, eyeglasses, and tools required for employment, etc. YOB youths needed cash for haircuts. Clothing and carfare needs were the most frequently cited. KEY reports noted that its youths' families were in such desperate need that the MDTA allowances were used up before such "frills" as clothing could bought.

At least three projects had loan funds available (Des Moines, NCCY, JOBS). A fourth donated money for clothing when the youths were ready to go to job interviews (VAS-Altro). One project also had a bonding program (JOBS) while another indicated the need for such a program (Neighborhood House) in order to make youths with delinquency records more acceptable to employers.

Some projects were able to raise money from private sources for loans. In some projects, the project personnel themselves advanced money to the youths (ABCD). Some projects were able to get cash for clothing and other needed items from the Department of Welfare for eligible youths. In others, various expedients to solve individual problems were sought (e.g., donations of clothing [KEY] ; special pleading for the client to finance companies and other creditors [Des Moines]; free hot lunches provided by local womens' groups [KEY] ; fare reductions for project youths on public transportation [Des Moines] .

The willingness of project personnel to make use of such expedients did much to create an aura of total commitment and "try anything" resourcefulness which characterized the E and D projects. However, relying upon such expedients had many undesirable consequences. The air of emergency involved, while exhilarating at first, obviously became wearing on project staff, leading to a relatively early "burn-out" of personnel. Such reliance meant that a great deal of time was consumed in developing community contacts on an ad hoc basis, and in seeking out and negotiating with sources of help, on a individual basis, for each youth with an emergency need. Such searching and negotiating was very costly in staff time and effort for relatively small pay-off in increasing the youth's employability, and meant that other services and activities had to be curtailed in the chaos of responding to crises.

These crises could have been handled more economically, if the projects had been able to buy directly the services needed, or to dispense money themselves. The money provides a mechanism for dealing with a variety of problems (rent, carfare, tools, clothing, etc.) so that the agencies do not have to respond to individual crises which have no carry-over value.

The disbursement of money provides the agencies with a valuable opportunity to engage the youth in counseling concerning his economic life which could be most effective. Having a slush fund for such purposes would therefore greatly enhance the agencies' counseling capability.

There are several reasons for strongly recommending that project budgets include slush funds for meeting financial emergencies of the youth. Such funds should permit expenditures up to a relatively low dollar limit per youth without accountability, in order to avoid the kind of accounting procedures which make it impossible for the funds to be used effectively in emergencies, or which so formalize their use that they would not serve effectively. In addition to small amounts for such informal uses as buying a youth a cup of coffee or paying his fare to a job interview, a larger dollar limit per capita should be available for legitimate purposes on a more formal basis with accountability requirements.

Legal Services

Several projects found occasion to seek legal aid for some youths and, in many projects, personnel made court appearances on behalf of their trainees. Neighborhood House used donated and low-fee lawyers. Hunter's Point included legal services, welfare aid, and police-parole services. YMCA, PAL, Springfield Goodwill, VAS-Altro, JOBS, Des Moines, CPI, and MFY were among those projects in which project personnel had contacts with courts, juvenile, and parole authorities. Lorton and ABCD report a need for legal services. The larger projects (MFY, CPI) had the use of legal services as a part of their organization. In others, project staff used their own legal knowledge (often inadequate) or solicited free or inexpensive services from private attorneys in the community or from governmental units.

There is obviously real need for legal services. Poor youths do not have access to lawyers and, while this may no longer be a problem in criminal cases since recent Supreme Court rulings requiring courts to appoint counsel, it is a problem in civil cases and in criminal cases which do not fall under court jurisdiction.

Further, projects need legal services to advise project personnel on the rights of the youths vis-a-vis school, welfare, and other bureaucracies; about civil service and other potential employers; and particularly concerning juvenile law. There is evidence that project personnel do not understand the special limited meaning of juvenile offenses and juvenile records, when reporting records of arrests or convictions on employment applications and civil service applications is at issue. There is also evidence that project personnel do not understand the rights of their clients and their clients' families under existing welfare laws, and have therefore acquiesced in decisions which deprived clients of benefits to which they were really entitled. Counsel would also enable projects to recover or replace some loan funds for clothing, carfare, etc., through knowledge of the rights of many clients to receive such supplements from welfare.

Neighborhood House also suggests that projects, in areas in which federal agencies are major potential employers, could profit from a civil service consultant who could offer advice regarding the right of youths to hearings nd appeals, the obligation to report juvenile records, etc. NCCY's experience with the Armed rces, who turned down youths simply because they had been remanded to a state school when the parental home was ruled inadequate, and Neighborhood House's experience with civil service authorities, who rejected youths without a hearing on the basis of minor delinquency records, point to the need for expert consultation in these areas.

For these reasons one could place the need for legal services second only to the need for loan funds in youth-serving agencies. In both cases there is some question as to whether the provision of such supportive services is properly the responsibility of the Department of Labor. The existing model of social services in the United States is one of compartmentalized and bureaucratized agencies. When an E and D project fills a gap left by the education, welfare, and legal institutions of America, it begins to operate on the alternative model of integrated services for a particular population, rather than the usual model of specialized services for the entire population. The logical extension of such a move to all other population groups would result in massive overlapping and mismatching with the existing organizations. The Department of Labor should consider the extent to which it will make explicit such a policy, and thus move toward a fairly fundamental reorganization of social-welfare programs on the national level, as part of the Department's long-term planning.

Health Care

Many of the projects reported on the poor physical health of the youths. Des Moines found that 41 percent of the youths had vision impairments; at NCCY 90 percent failed vision tests. Des Moines found 38 percent of the youths suffering problems of obesity. JOBS found 588 medical problems out of 1,135 youths. VAS-Altro found medical problems in 30 out of 40 trainees. In the Detroit program thorough physical examinations showed that 84 percent of the youths had medical problems, most of which would not have been picked up under routine, superficial screenings. Sixty percent of those problems were ultimately ascribable to poor nutrition and the project suggests that the fatigue and poor motivation of disadvantaged youths may be direct symptoms of underlying physical illnesses. JOBS and Philadelphia JEVS noted the need for treatment of VD, to which Philadelphia JEVS also adds TB. YOB also reported need for tatoo removal and plastic surgery to help youths appear more socially acceptable to potential employers.

Despite the apparent needs, projects varied widely in what they did about them. Davis Goodwill gave very superficial physical examinations but no ment, while VAS-Altro, also a sheltered workshop, provided extensive medical work-ups and treatment. PAL arranged to get glasses for its youths. Skills Center gave medical and dental assistance including free tooth-cleaning. Wise County solicited Vocational Rehabilitation to take care of eyes, teeth hearing, and cosmetic tooth defects, but the Skills Center found youths unwilling to accept referrals to Vocational Rehabilitation. KEY arranged for dental care from the Board Board of Education plus low fees from local dentists. Neighborhood House used the local health department and Department of Welfare for medical aid CPI, New Jersey OEO, Wise County, and NCCY either made referrals to existing agencies, solicited medical resources from their communities, or integrated in-house existing community resources on loan from other agencies. However, NMU found it impossible to remedy medical, optical, or dental problems through local resources, because the professional societies in the community reacted negatively to the project. Some projects were able to arrange for diagnostic examinations through local authorities (school physicians, local health department doctors, etc.) but they could not get treatment for the identified conditions (PAL). In Pinellas County, the county physician was unlicensed and thus not authorized to provide treatment. In New York City, youths had to apply for medical services as must any other indigent person, with the added difficulty that New York regulations required the permission of minors' parents before treatment could be rendered. For many poor youths, such a requirement is an impossibility, putting him and the agency into the position of having to collude in minor forgery, implicitly or explicity, which is hardly likely to enhance the youth's respect for law and social institutions.

Two projects had nurses on the project staff, and found them used extensively (VAS-Altro and ABCD). On the other hand, several projects did not report any medical services (KEY, Springfield Goodwill, YOB, among others).

Visual and dental care seemed to receive the most attention in project reports, with several projects able to make arrangements for free glasses from local optometric societies and free dental care from dental societies. However, medical care seemed to be a different matter and one suspects that the emphasis on vision and dentistry may be more a reflection of the cooperation of dentists and optometrists, and the unwillingness of physicians, than a reflection of the relative importance of the problems.

The project reports provide ample justification for medical, dental, and optometric services which include thorough diagnosis and treatment. However, many of the medical conditions encountered were chronic, non-debilitating, and not markedly influential in determining a youth's ability to get or keep a job. Whether the Department of Labor should fill the gaps left by current inadequate arrangements for providing for health care for all Americans remains a question. Most projects did not find the use of existing health agencies (county health departments, welfare departments) useful in providing all the health services required. It would be possible for the Department to provide funds for health purposes to E and D projects. Or it could build those services into agencies directly (as in France, in which a physician is part of the staff of each employment service office). Or, if it were to decide that it is not the appropriate agency to provide needed medical services, or that it did not wish to support the model of integrated services for special populations, as discussed earlier, the Department could instead support or sponsor legislation which would extend or amplify present health care programs. For example, it might be feasible and desirable to extend Medicare to all people receiving pay, allowances, or training under MDTA and to the families of such beneficiaries. This would permit projects and Youth Opportunity Centers to use the machinery which is already in existence and become fairly efficient in its operation, and would obviate the need for each project to make its own special arrangements for health care from already overused publicly-supported health agencies. It would also transfer the costs of medical care from the Department of Labor to the Medicare through Social Security.

Psychotherapy

Two projects (JOBS and CPI) had formal arrangements for providing psychotherapy for those youths showing evidence of severe personality disorders. In the case of CPI, the arrangements were free with the therapy provided for a limited number of cases at the local Veterans Administration Hospital. JOBS retained a private firm in group practice to provide consultation and individual therapy. Several other projects made referrals to community agencies: Des Moines recommended psychiatric evaluation (but apparently not treatment) for forty percent of the youths, on the basis of MMPI test results. PAL, Philadelphia JEVS, and VAS-Altro referred youths to other agencies, with VAS-Altro finding that eighty percent of the youths had severe emotional problems.[1] However, YMCA reports a need for psychiatric consultation, and Pinellas County found that local agencies were too busy to take the youths. No data are provided, by those projects which referred youths to community agencies, about the effectiveness of the referrals or the acceptance of the referrals by the receiving agencies.

[1] This figure is highly suspect, reflecting the psychopathology bias of the agency.

Recreation

Several projects provided recreational facilities for the youths (Pinellas County, NMU, CPI, MFY, Lane County, NCCY, were limited and relatively inactive in nature (e.g., pool tables, table tennis, lounges). Some also sponsored team sports, excursions, and the like. Often these activities were combined with cultural enrichment activities (trips to museums, theaters, music and art fairs, tourist sites). Most projects found their budget and staff too limited for effective use. Pinellas County suffered a space shortage, and KEY had to carve its recreational space into offices. KEY and YMCA used local YMCA facilities for recreation.

Lane County found that its public image was hurt by its recreation facilities. The public objected to seeing youth on MDTA allowances, ostensibly being prepared for public employment, spending their time at pool tables in the project quarters. The Skills Center, on the other hand, felt that its use of a sports league, and such extra-curricular activities as a jazz band, were helpful in giving the community exposure to the youths and in giving the youths greater contact with the community outside the ghetto. The difference between Lane County and the Skills Center probably lies in the degree of public appreciation for the recreation involved and the status accorded to athletic and musical skill.

Some recreational programs had other values. YOB used youth entertainment as a means of attracting youths to the project. PAL used social clubs as the context for social group work, and Temple organized group recreation to help the trainees form a group identity. NCCY used recreation to develop leadership skills in its youth. In several projects, the youths participated in planning their own recreation, with all the counseling values such planning participation entails (NMU, PAL, YOB). In three porjects, staff and clients participated together in entertainment and sports (YMCA, NMU, Pinellas County) as ways of building rapport and demonstrating to the youths that the staff enjoyed being with them.

Recreation is generally considered an absolute good, and some opportunities for recreation are necessary for youths who spend a significant amount of time in project facilities. However, the amount and type of recreation to be provided should be a function of the purposes it is to serve in the particular program. It appears from project reports that there were only a few cases in which the role of recreation in project goals was clearly assessed, or in which recreation was selectively used to contribute to those goals. One has the impression that some projects were beguiled by the razzle-dazzle of elaborate recreational programs, in an effort to show how unorthodox the projects were, but without objective evaluation of the use of the program, or its effectiveness in attracting youths to the project, for example. Nor do any of the project reports indicate that types of recreation were specifically selected in order to meet counseling goals for particular youths. Finally, some very good projects (in the sense of improving employability) were without recreational components, while some very poor ones included them. The reverse was also true. The appropriateness of a recreation program in an E and D program probably depends upon the extent to which the project limits itself to a work-training program, or broadens its self-definition to approximate settlement house functions.

Cultural Enrichment

Several projects included cultural enrichment programs, in which youths were exposed to some of the institutions and experiences with which ghetto dwellers typically have no contact. These included museum visits, excursions to a beach, to the theater, to baseball games, to local universities, etc. YMCA took its clients to tourist sites around New York; YOB had an elaborate enrichment program including visits to a university.

The assumption underlying the elaboration of cultural enrichment programs in employability-development agencies is that poor youths lack knowledge, much less appreciation, of cultural resources and that this lack leaves their lives poorer and makes them less able to respond appropriately to situations in which such knowledge is relevant. Such situations presumably arise at work, and lack of knowledge of things which middle-class people take for granted makes a youth appear more stupid than he is.

YMCA's visitation program also had the goal of making the boys' familiar with New York's public transportation system, so that they would be more willing and able to take jobs outside their immediate neighborhood. YOB's program also functioned as an aid to project recruiting, to attract youths to the project.

Like recreation, cultural enrichment is an absolute good. Such programs attempts to replace some aspects of the secondary education which poor youths have rejected. However, it is possible to question the extent to which such programs contribute to employability, and to discover how elaborate a program is needed to raise employability to measurable amounts. Does participation in a cultural enrichment program increase scores on culture-loaded tests? This is a researchable question. It would be relatively easy to observe placement and job-tenure rates among youths from a project permitted to participate in a cultural enrichment program and among another group from the same project for whom such participation was denied for purposes of the research.

Such a test would not, of course, determine policy on support of enrichment programs. It is possible that the Department conceives of its tasks more broadly than simply employability, and thus would favor enrichment programs in principle. The surplus value of enrichment programs in providing recreation, giving community exposure to the youths, and attracting disadvantaged youths to the project would also figure in a policy decision. All of these claimed values could be empirically tested. Do projects identical in all respects save for the presence or absence of an enrichment program differ in recruitment rates? Are community attitudes, assessed by survey methods, noticeably altered by the presence or absence of a cultural enrichment program? Are the attitudes of the youths toward the community affected by enrichment? Do youths in a project without enrichment program-produced recreation gripe more than those in a project with enrichment?

As in the case of recreational programs, there appears to be no correlation between program effectiveness and the presence or absence of enrichment activities. However, it does seem that those projects which were most noisy about enrichment were also the ones with relatively poor actual job training and placements. Cultural enrichment programs may increase the effectiveness of good job training and placement programs, but it appears unlikely that they can compensate for inadequate development along those lines. The extent to which cultural enrichment programs divert project staff from functions which ought to have higher priority is the extent to which such programs interfere with, rather than enhance, the project's mission.

Image-Building

Closely allied to cultural enrichment programs, and in some cases identical to them, are programs specifically designed to affect the youths' image of themselves as people with a history, a culture, and a role in the world which is of value. Obviously, such image-building is directed primarily at minority-group members (although of course all youths are members of a minority) and assumes the value of cultural diversity. Image-building programs included such activities as Negro History Week, Negro Art Fairs, Mexican Folk Dancing (YOB), and grooming and beauty clinics (YOB, Temple), etc.

In many projects the presumed value of such activities in enhancing self-concepts, in building pride and self-confidence, are further enhanced by involving the youths directly in the planning and execution of the activities and events (YOB). Thus image-building projects have both counseling and educational values, with all the learning implied in the opportunity for youths to cooperate and effectively produce something of recognized and real value. Such projects have the added advantage of providing good community exposure in a format which enhances the community's appreciation and respect for the youths who planned and carried out the event. The ultimate refinement is for the image-building activities to have direct relevance to the youths' job training (e.g., printer apprentices doing the printing, clerk trainees mailing the notices, carpenter trainees doing the necessary construction, etc.). This is a level of exquisiteness which is often not easy to arrange, and no examples of its achievement were present in project reports.

As with other supportive activities, there is much room for valid research to document the claimed values of image-building programs. Before and after studies of self-concept changes, of community attitudes, could be easily managed within the context of on-going project activities.

Role Models

Both explicitly and implicitly many projects arranged to provide youths with contact with people who could serve as role models. These arrangements ranged from bringing famous people who had begun life in poverty, or famous people of the same ethnic or racial backgrounds as the trainees, to the project, to role models closer to home: skilled workers from the youths' communities, project staff of the same racial-ethnic background, or visits from successful former trainees. YOB brought Negro businessmen, entertainers, and sports figures to the project. PAL and MFY used successful former trainees. Temple got successful Negro women to talk to the girls. Draper, a prison project, brought successful community leaders who were ex-convicts. St. Louis JEVS hired two Negro basketball stars as summer employees to help in counseling, recruiting, job development, and public relations. All projects employed staff members from minority groups; Pinellas County noted that it was the first time that many of the youths had ever had contact with an educated, professionally trained Negro. YMCA employed skilled Negroes as its instructors.

Role models seemed to serve three functions: inspirational, educational, and propagandistic. Inspirational models were those which tried to raise the aspirations of the youths by showing them the extent to which it is possible to be successful. Educational models serve as examples of behavior the youths can imitate. In a sense, the former serves a motivational purpose, while the latter produces learning. The third function, propaganda, was served by using prestige figures with whom the youths can identify to tell them things the project would like them to accept.

None of the project reports reflect well thought-out programming of role models beyond a fairly superficial use of the concept of identification. As a result, no project appears to have used role models to a maximum advantage, except perhaps YMCA. Nor did any of the projects use the extensive research on imitation learning, on level of aspiration, or on attitude change in programming their use of models. Some projects provided only brief and relatively distant contact with models from whom the youths were expected to learn responses, despite the research which indicates that imitation learning is maximized by the proper arrangements (e.g., use of a model older and larger than the youth, reward for the to-be-imitated response, opportunity to observe the response being rewarded, etc.). No project reported any data indicating that exposure to an inspirational model raised aspiration levels and, in any case, such effects are likely to be observed only when an opportunity is provided for the audience to make a response immediately after exposure to the inspirer, and this was typically not arranged. The vast social psychological research on the effects of prestige endorsement on attitude change was uniformly ignored.

These are unfortunate deficiencies, and are probably due to the absence of social scientists from project staffs. Few project directors have had sufficient contact with the research literature to make effective use of it in program planning. This is especially unfortunate with respect to the use of role models, which is potentially a very effective device. Inasmuch as it seems unlikely that E and D projects will add significantly to their capabilities for using the products of psychological and social research, OMPER should consider alternatives which might help projects make more effective use of role models. One such alternative would be the preparation of an extensive background paper on role models by a social scientist familiar with both the research literature and the operation of youth-serving agencies, to translate the findings of research into operational terms appropriate to the E and D projects.

Miscellaneous

Transportation

Many projects had transportation problems. When KEY was unable to develop a residential facility, it turned to bussing youths into the project from the hollows. They had to use GSA-supplied buses which were so unreliable as to seriously handicap the project. YOB and Neighborhood House report needs for transportation around town, to bring youths to the projects, to job sites, etc. Des Moines arranged for reduced fares on public transportation to help youths report for training. Lack of transportation kept many New Jersey OEO youths out of MDTA training.

JOBS rented transportation to take youths to new jobs; other projects hoped for driver training to enable youths to get to the project site, to go for job interviews, and to go to work when placed (YMCA, YOB, Neighborhood House, Lorton, Skills Center, NCCY, MFY, and New Jersey OEO). However, resources for providing driver education were limited, with the projects often relying on volunteers. New Jersey OEO used VISTA workers for some driver training, but other projects were not so fortunate. In two projects, there were reports of training youths for jobs which they then could not accept because they lacked driver's licenses (Lorton, YMCA). In both cases, youths were trained as auto mechanics, but could not work as such since they could not drive cars.

However, driver training is apparently not the complete answer even in Los Angeles, which has only the most limited public transportation system. YOB found that the cars available to the boys were broken-down wrecks that could not be relied on to get the boys to work on time; yet the alternative was for the boys to buy better cars at outrageous interest rates.

There is no simple solution to the transportation problem. Arranging for low fares on public transport systems appears to be a useful device.[2] Use of volunteers can also be helpful, although agencies typically find that it takes as much time and expense to administer it as would have taken to hire new staff members to do the same work. Project reports on the red-tape involved in getting GSA equipment, and on the poor quality of the equipment received, are uniform and rule out GSA as a source. In the long run, the most feasible arrangement would probably be for projects to lease the necessary vehicles. In any case, it seems clear that OMPER must be more generous in permitting budgeting for transportation expenses. Funding elaborate programs for making youths employable when they cannot take work because they cannot get to the project, to job interviews, or to the places of employment, is like designing a magnificent house without entrances or stairs.

[2] It would have been useful for projects such as KEY to train their clients to operate a transportation system, including chauffering, vehicle maintenance and repair, etc. This would provide effective job training as well as solve the transportation problem.

Babysitting

Second only to transportation problems as a roadblock to effective utilization of E and D project resources by poor youths is the need for babysitting services. Several projects indicated that they lost many girls because satisfactory arrangements could not be made to care for their infants while they were in training (VAS-Altro, Temple, JOBS). JOBS provided loans to pay for babysitting, while CPI had a day care center. For those projects large enough to provide for day care, such an arrangement would be the best so far as keeping the girls in the project. It might also be noted that such a center could serve as a job training site for child-care workers (teacher aides, nursery assistants, practical nursing for children, etc.). For smaller projects, it might be appropriate for the project to arrange a contract with a local public or private nursery to provide day care services for the clients' infants and children at a fixed fee to the E and D project. As a last resort, providing funds for private babysitters should be permitted, although this arrangement is clearly poorer than contracting child-care services from some community resource.

IV

Summary of Recommendations for Programs, Plans, and Policies

FUTURE E AND D POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Project Initiation and Planning

1. OMPER should shift its stance from one of encouraging service agencies and organizations to submit proposals, to one of sponsoring projects whose major functions are innovation, testing programs through practical application, demonstration to operating agencies, generation of hypotheses to be empirically tested, and identification of areas in which knowledge relevant to agency practice is required. Such a policy would be more compatible with OMPER's need to exercise control over projects to permit the coordinated testing of programs in good vs. poor labor market areas, in rural *vs.* urban centers, using professional vs. nonprofessional manpower, with and without image-building supportive services, etc. The period of random trying-out of ideas, based on local initiative, should be ended as no longer fruitful in the absence of more definitive tests of efficiency.

2. OMPER should require proposals for E and D contracts to be specific in language and intention. Project proposals should not only include the statements that "new techniques" will be tried, but should specify the nature of the technique to be attempted, the nature of the evidence sufficient to validate or invalidate the continued use of the technique, the approximate limits of the time period within which the approach will be tried, and the alternatives should the approach be invalidated. While OMPER would not wish to rigidify projects by requiring close adherence to such plans, OMPER should be assured that agencies

have given adequate and explicit consideration to such matters in advance of operation.

3. The level of planning recommended requires that OMPER provide projects with funds for program development, pilot-testing, and feasibility study before full scale operating funds are obligated. This requires some method of obligating funds for more than one year, such as that used by the National Institutes of Health.

4. OMPER should require agencies to have training and placement resources which go beyond a statement of capacity for development of such resources in advance of operation. These should include commitments to develop and/or operate training programs, and commitments to employ project-referred youths. The development of such resources would be made possible by pre-operational program planning funds.

5. OMPER should not sponsor programs in which work experience training is conducted by agencies over which the project has no supervisory control, or in which special training of the supervisors involved has not been included.

6. Project proposals should include detailed plans and schedules for phasing out the project at the termination of the contract procedure, with a firm set of deadlines for the steps involved, to become operative at a set date in advance of contract expiration if firm commitment of further funding has not yet been received.

7. OMPER should acquire panels of consultants to review and evaluate project proposals, and to advise OMPER on such matters as feasibility, capability of the agency for the project, and validity of the proposed procedures.

Project Operations

1. OMPER should require periodic status reports from all projects, using common definitions of such matters as placement records, dropouts, etc. These reports should include follow-up data on lengths of placements, wages received, as well as descriptions of processes (e.g., assessment techniques and counseling procedures).

2. OMPER should make independent consultants available to pay periodic visits to the projects for training, advising, and consultation with project staff.

It should be clearly understood by the consultants, contractors, and OMPER that such consultants will play no part in evaluating projects or in making decisions regarding funding or contract renewal.

3. OMPER staff should be expanded to make it possible to provide adequate supervision of the extent to which contractors fulfill contract obligations. It should also have available independent (i.e., consultative) experts for advice on technical matters concerning assessment, research, counseling, and behavior modification.

4. Arrangements should be made to permit projects to phase-in youths at less than full-time, with MDTA allowances proportionately reduced for those youths not ready for full-time participation. Projects should also be able to reward good performances by raising the allowances of trainees at various points in their training careers.

5. Project sponsorship should include and demand follow-up counseling after placement and career-development activities.

6. OMPER should provide projects with funds for loans to trainees and for the purchase of supportive services (e.g., medical and dental care, legal aid, bonding, purchase of clothing, haircuts, provision of transportation, and babysitting).

7. Residential facilities should be provided when needed, but in a way that avoids project responsiblity for, and interference in, the private lives of the clients unrelated to employability. Suitable arrangements would include rental of YMCA rooms, rooming and boarding houses, and other independently operated public accomodations.

8. Mobile teams are preferable to residential centers for rural populations, except where the aim of the project is urbanization. In the latter case, projects should be located in the urban areas which could serve as suitable relocation goals for the youths.

9. Project funds should be adequate to offer professional personnel competitive salaries with those employed in operating agencies. A higher proportion of funds for administrative staff and operations should be expected than is typical in operating agencies.

OMPER Policies

1. OMPER should devise a clear policy concerning the meaning of experimentation and demonstration. Projects should be funded on the basis of their ability to develop, try, and assess innovative program features, and/or apply social science knowledge in agency settings. Sponsorship should not be on the basis of local service needs to a disadvantaged population, except as the ability to deliver services is a test of the program features. Within these limits, programs should be able to use the resources of the most creative and effective personnel in ways which may serve as models to other agencies operated by more typical representatives of the same manpower pool. Program features which rely on the use of professional personnel not available to operating agencies (e.g., psychiatrists) are of little value for experimental-demonstration purposes.

2. OMPER should shift some of its resources from the support of projects concerned directly with counseling and assessment to those concerned with experimentation and demonstration of job development techniques.

3. OMPER should seek legislation and/or administrative arrangements so that a single authority can be responsible for funding and overseeing project operation and its associated MDTA, OJT, and WET training. This body should have the authority to provide all the necessary approvals and clearances now required from state and federal educational authorities, and state and federal employment services.

4. OMPER should develop its ability to produce and distribute relevant program materials to E and D and operating agencies. Such materials include descriptions of applications, in program terms, of recent research in the social and behavioral sciences, information about apparently successful program features, and reviews of assessment and counseling practice techniques.

5. OMPER should seek legislation to prevent discrimination by unions in apprenticeship training programs and in union membership.

6. OMPER should expand the availability of vocational training in the apprenticeable trades.

7. OMPER should initiate long-range plans for the expansion of accessibility to vocational training on a national scale. Such expansion requires resources

beyond those available to school systems, should include the resources of industry, and should be predicated on the principle that the methods of training must be adaptable to the needs and capacities of the trainees, rather than on the notion of eligibility and suitability of trainees for invariant training methods. Test criteria of admissability to training, such as GATB scores, should be abandoned.

8. OMPER should initiate steps to modify those civil service and merit system procedures which discriminate against the disadvantaged. Specifically: (1) educational requirements which have not been empirically demonstrated to predict job success and tests whose correlations with defensible criteria of job performance are less than .70, should be found to be in non-compliance with standards of equality-of-access to government employment; (2) pass-fail cut-off scores should be set at the minimum level required for acceptable job performance; and (3) selection from among those passing should be either on a random basis or on the basis of need, rather than on the basis of score ranking.

9. OMPER should develop national resources for producing, organizing, and communicating program-relevant research on manpower and manpower services. These resources should include adequately financed research laboratories or centers, independent of direct federal control, but intimately associated with E and D and/or operating agencies. These laboratories would be required to satisfy program personnel's need for information, and the operating agencies would be required to try out in practice the conclusions of the research. Such research centers would best operate through the construction of a defined set of priorities in researchable questions over a ten-year period, with annual review of progress toward the dicennial objectives.

10. The sheltered workshop format for employability development should be encouraged. The capability and efficiency of such programs would be enhanced if staff time did not have to be devoted to soliciting subcontracts from manufacturers, and if such programs could offer trainees a variety of work tasks which go beyond the most simple, routine ones. OMPER should seek legislation which would give such programs (including non-profit work-training cooperatives) something like "most favored nation" status in competing for federal contracts and subcontracts from federal contractors.

11. OMPER should seek legislation which would extend Medicare to recipients of MDTA training allowances and their dependents.

12. The requirement that young school drop-outs be out of school for one year to be eligible for MDTA training pay and allowances is non-functional and should be abandoned.

OMPER-Supported Research

A review of project reports concerning assessment, counseling, and supportive services suggests that OMPER should support the following research as immediately relevant to project and operating agency programs:

1. Replication of the Federal Department Store project in similar and in other industries. Recent action by the Ford Motor Company, in eliminating selection tests, suggests an opportunity to validate the hypothesis that after a suitable period of training and experience, workers who could not have passed the test perform as well as those who could.

2. Development, standardization, and validation of a short-form reading test.

3. Development, standardization, and validation of an arithmetic test with norms based on needs for the amount and type of mathematical-computational skills required in various entry-level occupations.

4. Development of a picture vocational interest test.

5. Empirical research on the generality of "work habits" and "work role skills" in disadvantaged youths, and the extent to which such responses are affected by levels and types of work incentives in disadvantaged compared to non-disadvantaged youths.

6. Experimental comparison among four program orders: work-role (prevocational) training before skill training; work-role training concurrent with skill training; skill training without associated work-role training; and skill training followed by work-role training.

7. Development, standardization, and validation of work-sample testing, to include: (a) samples of tasks requiring the same psychomotor and cognitive skills but differing in the industries in which the tasks are used; (b) independent

scores for work skills and for area of interest (in terms of industry-type); (c) comparison of experienced and inexperienced workers on the tasks; (d) uncontaminated evaluations of the predictive validity of scores; and (e) acceptability of work sample scores to employers.

8. Experimental comparisons of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged youths regarding the differential effect on work performance of changes in incentive levels, and in responsiveness to achievement, money, and social approval incentives (rewards). At the time of writing this summary, a publication has appeared which refers to unpublished data supporting the notion that lower-class boys are more differentially responsive to monetary and social rewards than middle-class boys. The implications of these findings for programming, if they are confirmed, are discussed in the body of this report.

9. Research on the validity of a youth's self-assessment of his job readiness compared to agency assessment, comparison of project-sponsored and unsponsored disadvantaged youths in placement and job-tenure rates, and on the placement success of those who refuse counseling and training compared to those who accept project services other than placement.

10. Comparison of three alternative models of service delivery: (a) staff specialization (i.e., separate intake, counseling, placement, and follow-up staffs); (b) staff generalization (i.e., single counselor performs all services to client, following same client through from intake to follow-up); (c) nonprofessional facilitator-intermediary who follows client through from intake to follow-up, mediating client contact with staff specialists (testers, counselors, job developers, and follow-up).

11. Comparison of placement and job-tenure rates of youths accompanied to job interviews and actively sponsored to potential employers with those of youths unaccompanied and/or not actively sponsored to employers.

12. Comparison of work effectiveness on a criterial task following a series of training tasks, in which programmed reinforcers or rewards are made contingent upon increasingly high standards and precision of performance, with and without a final period of permissiveness regarding performance standards.

13. Research on lateness, absence from training, and missed interview

appointments, to evaluate the extent to which such non-participation is a result of poor time sense, lack of clocks or watches, a response to anticipated failure, related to the quality of the job, to age of the youth, to relevance of the activity to competence in good-paying jobs; comparison of the no-show rates in employment interviews of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged youths and adults.

14. Development of a reliable, easily used form or rating schedule for rating disadvantaged youths in work experience training, that can be used, with high reliability, by subprofessional supervisors and that has clear criteria for rating.

OPERATING AGENCY PRACTICES

Intake

1. Intake should be arranged so that youths may begin active participation in agency programs immediately. The shorter the delay, the more youths follow through.

2. Testing should not be done as part of intake. Ability criteria should not be used to exclude youths from agency services. Youths of low intelligence do not necessarily perform unacceptably in industrial work-training tasks.

3. Most youths come to projects in order to get jobs. Such expectations should be recognized and accepted, and the relevance of intake procedures to the youths' motivation should be emphasized.

Assessment

1. The amount and type of assessment should be commensurate with the project's capacity for acting on the test results. Where training and placement resources are limited, and associated with work in which interest and aptitude contribute little to performance, there is no point to ability, interest, and aptitude testing.

2. Training should be adapted to the trainee's ability, rather than requiring that trainees be selected on the basis of their ability.

3. Tests of academic aptitude (i.e., intelligence tests) are, for most disadvantaged youths, irrelevant, inappropriate, and nonproductive considering the jobs available to them.

4. Youths should be well prepared for testing and tests should not be administered until they are accepted and understood by the youths, and until defenses against the tests, in the form of minimal involvement and striving, have been calmed.

5. Disadvantaged youths, as a group, tend to do well on measures of manipulative skill. Training and placements should emphasize jobs which make use of this kind of ability. Youths score relatively low in outdoor interests, a finding which should be used in developing training and placement resources.

6. Test-retest evaluations of program effectiveness are useless in the absence of similar measures on non-program disadvantaged youths.

7. Clinical assessments of personality and adjustment are largely unrelated to vocational planning, invade privacy, and are resented by the youths.

8. Diagnostic assessments of basic skills (reading, arithmetic) should be appropriate to the needs of the occupations for which the youths are being trained.

9. Work-experience stations should include a sufficient range of activities for there to be a basis for reliable assessment of the skills, interests, and aptitudes which can be generalized to other occupational settings. Work-experience supervisors should be trained to work with disadvantaged youths, and assess them, for these assessments to be useful. Useful assessment of behavior in work-experience training requires fairly detailed and comprehensive ratings, for which well worked-out rating schedules with clear criteria are needed.

10. Extreme caution should be used in using work-experience performance evaluations in judging job readiness; there is no evidence for the validity of such evaluations as predictors of success in other occupational settings.

11. Work-sample testing is among the most potentially fruitful assessment devices. However, until these are standardized and validated, there is the danger that such tests may add to disadvantagement of those without occupational experience.

12. Projects should encourage self-assessment by trainees, and provide opportunities for youths to make such self-assessment in real-work situations. There is no reason or evidence to support the notion that when a youth's self-assessments are higher than the project's assessments, the youth's assessments are less accurate than the project's. There is some evidence for the validity of youths' self-assessments of job readiness, and projects should be willint to accept and act upon such self-assessments.

accept and act upon such self-assessments.

13. Short-term placements on temporary jobs are an excellent means for making self-assessments realistic.

14. Rotating youths through a variety of work experience stations in order to provide an opportunity for self-assessment appears to be frustrating to the youths.

15. The most effective training in taking employment tests specific to the test to be taken, is offered when the youth has scheduled himself to take the test, and is given when the youth knows people like himself who have been successful in preparing for the test and have gotten good jobs as a result.

16. Agencies should, as much as possible, encourage employers to drop discriminatory, irrelevant, and low-validity selection tests.

Training

1. Work-experience training is most effective when the agency has control and supervision of the work stations and supervisors (except in the relatively rare cases in which independent work-experience sites and personnel are experienced and trained in working with disadvantaged youths). Thus, in general, agency-operated work-experience stations are better than out-stations in other, independent establishments.

2. Work-role training (pre-vocational training) appears most effective when it is a part of training in actual job skills leading to good jobs, rather than preceding such skill training.

3. Performance standards should be gradually escalated during the course of training. Monetary incentives should also be increased; performance tends to improve as pay scales increase. This schedule may necessitate starting some youths, particularly younger clients, at less than full time in the program. Progress through the program should be encouraged by the use of rewards clearly understood by the youths as signals of observable movement toward a worthwhile job.

4. Acceptance of and motivation for training is facilitated by arranging contact between the trainees and former trainees who have been successfully placed in good status, well-paying jobs.

5. The most effective counseling about behavior patterns is that which takes place on the spot in the situation in which the youths' behavior demonstrates a need for counseling intervention. The more that the counselor is able to participate in work training when the youths are actually in worker roles, the better able the counselor is to provide focused, immediate, and behaviorally relevant counseling, and to help the youth discover and recognize his achievements and gains, as well as his areas of ineffective functioning.

6. Training for entry jobs should be practical and accomplished through actual performance as much as possible, rather than through verbal instruction. It should make minimum demands for passive listening to verbal messages, and should involve no more theoretical-intellectual material than that actually required for acceptable entry-job performance. Higher-level training should be reserved for further career development after placement. Direct motor performance is more effective than watching or seeing someone else perform, but both are better than hearing about performance. Use of successful, skilled craftsmen as vocational instructors contributes to the relevance and motivating effects of training.

Counseling

1. Counseling should be directly tied to the youths' concrete present experience.

2. Vocational planning should involve breaking long-term goals down into intermediate short-term goals, readily achievable by the youth, in which the relationship of each step to the final goal is clearly defined.

3. Vocational planning in terms of interest and aptitudes should be no more elaborate and extended than the agency's ability to train and place the youth in accordance with his aptitudes and interests.

4. Counseling should not be a hurdle before placement; youths who do not want counseling should be placed on a job as a reality in connection with which he may then be counseled after placement. Short-term temporary placements and part-time jobs are useful for such purposes, especially for younger clients. However, such placements are not likely to be successful unless the agency honors

a commitment for post-placement counseling and later job-upgrading.

5. Counseling should be job-focused, and should not invade areas of privacy, values, morals, or other matters in these areas unless they are clearly related to job-getting, keeping, and advancing. Middle-class behavior norms not directly related to employability should not be the concern of the counselor, nor should they be criteria of job readiness.

6. Counseling should accompany training, placement, and follow-up rather than precede them.

7. Disadvantaged youths tend to respond well to counseling which uses group supports and peer interactions. Counseling groups should be heterogenous with respect to age, experience as workers, and talkativeness, but probably not sex. Group discussions should be loosely structured to insure that necessary topics are covered. It is best to deal with matters as they become relevant (e.g., discuss employment interviews when counselees are ready to be sent on placements) rather than in advance as "general preparation."

8. Most youths come to agencies in search of jobs. They should be placed as soon as possible, and the major efforts of counseling in terms of interests, aptitudes, and career planning should take place after placement.

9. Counselors and agencies should not represent themselves as being any more permissive than they actually are. Behavior standards and demands should be realistic, relevant to employability, and guided by the needs of the youths rather than those of the agency and its personnel. The areas and limits of permissiveness and firmness should be clearly established and shared with the clients. Wherever possible, sanctions should not be used which estrange the youth from the agency, or which make it difficult for him to return to the agency.

10. Youths' commitment to the agency and its programs are strengthened by their participation in agency operations (e.g., aiding in recruitment to the agency and helping tutor other clients).

11. Counselors should demonstrate their commitment to clients by accepting client criticisms and suggestions, and by supporting their clients in their real-world problems and interactions in the community.

12. Wherever possible and just, counselors should attempt to change

environmental pressures on their clients, rather than attempt to make the client responsible for changing himself and his reactions to hostile and disadvantaging forces.

13. Strategies of success are effective in raising youths' anticipations of success in satisfying their desire for jobs, status, and money. Such strategies include exposure to successful clients, to role models whom the youths perceive as realistically like themselves, and to successful people of similar class, race, and ethnic background. Imitation of such models is maximized when the youths have the opportunity to practice the model's actions and verbal behavior, to observe the model being rewarded for his behavior, and to be rewarded for successful imitation. Use of indigenous personnel encourages this process. Photos, prizes, money, awards, and diplomas may be used as rewards, however, they should be reliably connected with his ultimate goals (i.e., placement on a good job).

14. Communication and modeling are facilitated when the counselors are of the same racial, ethnic, and class background as the clients (other things being equal).

15. Counseling interventions with clients' families are appreciated by the youths, and parents' visits to training sites impress parents and motivate them to support the agency and its program for their children. Concrete suggestions for specific actions which parents can take are more effective than appeals for general cooperation.

16. Counselors should not assume that youths can tell time, have watches, and can time-schedule themselves, nor should they assume that disadvantaged youths can follow verbal directions. Instead of waiting until the client must admit inadequacy in these areas, counseling personnel should operate to prevent lateness and embarrassment in advance by suggesting that clients buy alarm clocks, by suggesting rehearsals of use of the public transportation system immediately before need to use it, by showing clients routes and locations on city-plan maps which clients can keep, etc.

17. Counseling should never be used to "hold" a youth until a placement is available. If a good job is not available, the youth should be placed in a series

of low-level jobs until a good training or job placement is available, and as often as needed until the youth can be lastingly placed. This can only work if the agency can in fact deliver good training and good jobs in a reasonable time period.

18. Counseling regarding money management should be done at the time the youth is paid.

19. Counselors should be knowledgeable in juvenile and welfare law, and should know their youths' rights, or they should have legal counsel available to provide such information.

Placement and Follow-up

1. Placement should be done by the youth's counselor. Counseling and training (including role playing) in such matters as interview behavior and filling out applications is most effective when done at the time when the youth is to be sent on a placement.

2. Job development should be begun for a youth as soon after he enters the agency program as possible. The youth should participate in the job-development activity, and job-search techniques can be taught effectively in connection with such job-development activity.

3. Job banks and agency-initiated worker cooperatives selling services to the public are effective placement devices with important training and counseling values.

4. Skills in getting a job are different from those involved in keeping a job, and are less important. Time is better spent on the latter than on the former, with the counselor accompanying those youths who lack enough of the former kind of skill and sponsoring them to prospective employers as an effective supplement. Such activity also provides an excellent context and opportunity for effective counseling.

5. Agencies should be prepared to place a youth as often as he needs it. They should never abandon a youth as unplaceable. Neither counselor nor youth should expect the first referrals to be successful or the first placements to be enduring. The youth should know that the counselor will keep trying.

6. Career-development counseling should follow placement, as should

counseling regarding the realities of such matters as relating to supervisors, and customers. Placement should thus initiate the major counseling effort, rather than conclude it.

7. Counselors should have access to experts in civil service and the rights of juvenile offenders to gain knowledge on the necessity for reporting records, and clients' appeal rights.

8. Employers appear to be receptive to hiring disadvantaged youths as a package including follow-up services to employer and youth.

9. Youths are more likely to continue in follow-up aimed at job retention and promotion if they are provided with released time from work for that purpose.

10. First placements which contain significant (and real) potentials for on-the-job training and career development should be emphasized.

11. Follow-up should begin right after placement; the first few days on a job are the most difficult. The counselor should initiate exploration of potential trouble spots, because disadvantaged youths are often unaware of developing problems until it is too late. Counselors can sometimes help by counseling the employer or supervisor to make appropriate adjustment in the work situation.

12. Counselors should not intervene with employers without the clients' knowledge and permission.

Supportive Services

1. While agencies should have resources for providing youths with decent living quarters when necessary, residential programs and agency sponsorship or supervision of the living quarters should be avoided. Mobile teams are preferable to residential programs in rural areas.

2. Agencies should have loan funds so that youths may be paid on time when allowance checks are late, and to make it possible for trainees to buy needed work clothes, tools, and services.

3. Agencies should have funds for providing baby-care services for female trainees, for leasing transportation for trainees who lack other means of going to training and job interviews, or for paying for taxis. Funds should be available for medical and dental services, including corrective and therapeutic treatment;

for providing needy trainees with clothing; for buying needed legal services, and psychotherapy, when these services are not readily available in the community. Funds for such purposes are likely to be more economical than the diversion of staff time to mobilizing community resources, soliciting contributions, etc., on an *ad hoc* basis.

4. Recreation, cultural enrichment, and image-building activities may be helpful and desirable, but should be managed so as to maximize the recruitment, counseling, training, and placement functions, they should never divert resources away from the latter activities, so that they operate as substitutes for good counseling, training, and placement. However, the agency should be clearly allied with the community's definition of its needs, and should demonstrate its commitment to the disadvantaged community, its self-respect, and its strengths by agency cooperation in furthering community goals and by its responsiveness to the wishes and influence of the community.

Agency Structure and Administration

1. Agencies serving the disadvantaged require relatively larger administrative staffs and budgets than similar agencies serving non-disadvantaged populations.

2. Agencies serving the disadvantaged should be funded on the basis of the extent of disadvantagement of its clients. The more disadvantaged the cases, the larger the amount per caseload should be. This will encourage agencies to continue to serve the difficult and most needy clients, rather than drifting toward the more placeable clients.

3. Agency structure should not be so rigid and compartmentalized that it is resistent to changes in its operations. Openness to change is aided by a staff organization in which there is a flexible relationship between staff functions and professional allegiance. In other words, staff functions should not be rigidly divided along professional lines.

4. Work load and operations should be arranged so that there is no tendency to cut corners by reducing, postponing, or rushing the preparation of clients for testing. This function appears to be particularly susceptible to being elided or

forgotten.

5. The same should be said for follow-up. Operations and record-keeping should be structured so that there is no tendency to consider a case closed, even provisionally, because a youth has been placed in an entry-level job. Clear criteria for closing a case should be developed and used, so that counselors are not tempted or permitted to forget about placed youths for whom counseling directed at job retention and upgrading would be appropriate.

6. The agency should service no more youths than it can train and/or place. Every youth accepted for service should be continued until he is successful. It is better to tell a youth that the agency does not have any jobs or training for him, than it is to "hold" the youth in counseling, making the youth feel that the deficient is in himself rather than in the job market or the agency's access to the market.

7. Regularly scheduled staff supervisory sessions, individual and group, should be treated as inviolable, and should never be eroded by demands for service.

8. Agencies should have a structure for regularly monitoring their own activities, so that it can have a basis for detecting needs and opportunities for improving its services, and for knowing the extent to which it is successful. This requires sampling the placement and job tenure rates of non-project youths in the community from time to time.

9. The agency should have access to legal, civil service, welfare, and civil rights experts, rather than relying on its own knowledge in these areas.

10. Agency staffs should include non-professionals for providing those services not requiring professional training. The integrity of the supervision of such nonprofessionals should be preserved.

11. Agencies should have a detailed plan for the rational phasing out of operations in a way that does not adversely affect the morale and effectiveness of the youths being served by the agency during phase-out. Phase-out should never be so abrupt that it represents a reneging on commitments to the youths already in the program. For such a plan to function as an effective preventative of disillusion and disappointment, it should contain criteria for automatically

invoking the plan in advance of the cessation of funds, thus preventing last minute cliff-hanging acts. The lead time for beginning the operation of the plan should be at least as long as the time it would take to liquidate the program successfully; if it takes three months to phase out, the plan should be begun if renewal of funding has not been received three months before the expiration of the current funding period.

Appendix

Abbreviation	Contractor
ABCD	Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. Boston, Massachusetts
Action Housing	Action Housing, Inc.
CAY	Community Action for Youth Cleveland, Ohio
CCY	Citizens Committee on Youth Cincinnati, Ohio
CPI	Community Progress, Inc. New Haven, Connecticut
Davis Goodwill	Davis Memorial Goodwill Industries
Des Moines	Council of Social Agencies Des Moines, Iowa
Detroit	Community Action for Detroit Youth Detroit, Michigan
Draper	Alabama State Board of Correction Draper Correctional Center Elmore, Alabama
Hunter's Point	San Francisco Committee on Youth (Hunter's Point Project) San Francisco, California
JOBS	Job Opportunities Through Better Skills Chicago, Illinois
JOIN	JOIN New York, New York

Abbreviation	Contractor
Kansas City JEVS	Jewish Vocational Service Kansas City, Missouri
KEY	Action for Appalachian Youth Charleston, West Virginia
Lane Co.	Lane County Youth Study Board Eugene, Oregon
Lorton	Lorton Youth Correctional Center Lorton, Virginia
MFY	Mobilization for Youth New York, New York
NCCY	National Committee for Children and Youth Washington, D. C. and Baltimore, Maryland
NH	Neighborhood House, Inc. I North Richmond, California
NILE	National Institute for Labor Education
New Jersey OEO	New Jersey Office of Economic Opportunity Trenton, New Jersey
NMU	Northern Michigan University Marquette, Michigan
PAL	Police Athletic League New York, New York
Philadelphia JEVS	Jewish Employment and Vocational Service Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Pinellas Co.	Pinellas County Board of Public Instruction Clearwater, Florida
Springfield Goodwill	Goodwill Industries of Springfield Springfield, Massachusetts
St. Louis JEVS	Jewish Employment and Vocational Service St. Louis, Missouri
Syracuse Skills Center	Mayor's Commission for Youth Syracuse, New York

Abbreviation	Contractor
Temple	Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
UL-NAACP	Cleveland Urban League Cleveland, Ohio
VAS-Altro	Vocational Advisory Service New York, New York
WAY	Washington Action for Youth
Wise County	Wise County School Board Wise, Virginia
YMCA	YMCA of Greater New York New York, New York
YOB I and II	Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles Los Angeles, California